

The VIMOS Public Extragalactic Redshift Survey (VIPERS) ★ Measuring nonlinear galaxy bias at $z \sim 0.8$

C. Di Porto¹, E. Branchini^{2,3,4}, J. Bel⁵, F. Marulli^{6,1,7}, M. Bolzonella¹, O. Cucciati¹, S. de la Torre⁸, B. R. Granett⁵, L. Guzzo^{5,11}, C. Marinoni¹², L. Moscardini^{6,1,7}, U. Abbas¹⁵, C. Adami⁸, S. Arnouts^{8,16}, D. Bottini¹⁷, A. Cappi^{1,18}, J. Coupon¹⁹, I. Davidzon^{6,1}, G. De Lucia⁹, A. Fritz¹⁷, P. Franzetti¹⁷, M. Fumana¹⁷, B. Garilli^{8,17}, O. Ilbert⁸, A. Iovino⁵, J. Krywult²⁰, V. Le Brun⁸, O. Le Fèvre⁸, D. Maccagni¹⁷, K. Małek²¹, H. J. McCracken²², L. Paiono¹⁷, M. Polletta¹⁷, A. Pollo^{13,14}, M. Scodeggio¹⁷, L. A. M. Tasca⁸, R. Tojeiro²⁵, D. Vergani²⁶, A. Zanichelli²⁷, A. Burden²⁵, A. Marchetti^{5,29}, D. Martizzi³⁰, Y. Mellier²², R. C. Nichol²⁵, J. A. Peacock²⁸, W. J. Percival²⁵, M. Viel^{9,10}, M. Wolk²², and G. Zamorani¹

(Affiliations can be found after the references)

Received –; accepted –

ABSTRACT

Aims. We use the first release of the Vimos Public Extragalactic Redshift Survey of galaxies (VIPERS) of $\sim 50,000$ objects to measure the biasing relation between galaxies and mass in the redshift range $z = [0.5, 1.1]$.

Methods. We estimate the 1-point distribution function [PDF] of VIPERS galaxies from counts in cells and, assuming a model for the mass PDF, we infer their mean bias relation. The reconstruction of the bias relation from PDFs is performed through a novel method that accounts for Poisson noise, redshift distortions, inhomogeneous sky coverage and other selection effects. With this procedure we constrain galaxy bias and its deviations from linearity down to scales as small as $4 h^{-1}$ Mpc and out to $z = 1.1$.

Results. We detect small ($\lesssim 3\%$) but significant deviations from linear bias. The mean biasing function is close to linear in regions above the mean density. The mean slope of the biasing relation is a proxy to the linear bias parameter. It increases both with luminosity, in agreement with results of previous analyses, and with redshift. However, we detect a strong bias evolution only for $z > 0.9$ in agreement with some, but not all, previous studies. We also detected a significant increase of the bias with the scale, from 4 to 8 h^{-1} Mpc, now seen for the first time out to $z = 1$. The amplitude of nonlinearity depends on redshift, luminosity and on scales but no clear trend is detected. Thanks to the large cosmic volume probed by VIPERS we find that the mismatch between the previous estimates of bias at $z \sim 1$ from zCOSMOS and VVDS-Deep galaxy samples is fully accounted for by cosmic variance.

Conclusions. The results of our work confirm the importance of going beyond the over-simplistic linear bias hypothesis showing that non-linearities can be accurately measured through the applications of the appropriate statistical tools to existing datasets like VIPERS.

1. Introduction

Galaxies do not perfectly trace mass. The long known proof is the fact that galaxy clustering properties depend on galaxies' intrinsic features like luminosity, color, morphology, stellar mass and so on (e.g. Szapudi et al. 2000; Hawkins et al. 2001; Norberg et al. 2001, 2002; Zehavi et al. 2002, 2011; Meneux et al. 2009; Marulli et al. 2013) and not only on the underlying mass distribution. Such differences are driven by the physical processes that regulates the formation and evolution of galaxies and should vanish on scales much larger than those affected by such processes.

Modelling these processes, or at least their impact on the bias relation between the spatial distribution of mass and that of galaxies is of paramount importance to extract cosmological information from the large scale structure of the galaxy distribution. Indeed, the large scale structure of the Universe as traced by the spatial distribution of galaxies is one of the most powerful cosmological probes as testified by the increasing number of large galaxy redshift surveys either ongoing (e.g. Boss (Anderson et al. 2012), DES¹ and VIPERS (Guzzo et al. 2013)) or planned for the near future (like eBOSS², DESI (Schlegel et al. 2011) and Euclid (Laureijs et al. 2011))³. These surveys are designed to address several important questions both in cosmology and in galaxy evolution theory. Chief among them is the origin of the accelerated expansion of the Universe.

It has recently been realized that the classical geometrical tests based on standard candles or on standard rulers can be used to constrain the expansion history of the Universe but cannot identify the cause of the accelerated expansion since the same expansion history can be obtained either advocating a Dark Energy component or by modifying the gravity theory (e.g. Wang 2008). This degeneracy can be broken by considering cosmic

★ Based on observations collected at the European Southern Observatory, Paranal, Chile, under programmes 182.A-0886 (LP) at the Very Large Telescope, and also based on observations obtained with MegaPrime/MegaCam, a joint project of CFHT and CEA/DAPNIA, at the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT), which is operated by the National Research Council (NRC) of Canada, the Institut National des Science de l'Univers of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) of France, and the University of Hawaii. This work is based in part on data products produced at TERAPIX and the Canadian Astronomy Data Centre as part of the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope Legacy Survey, a collaborative project of NRC and CNRS. The VIPERS web site is <http://vipers.inaf.it/>.

¹ www.darkenergysurvey.com

² <http://www.sdss3.org/future/>

³ <http://www.euclid-ec.org/>

structures and their growth, an additional dataset that provides constraints independent from the geometrical ones (Guzzo et al. 2008). The analysis of the large scale structures in the galaxy distribution allows to perform two types of test in one go. The apparent location of the baryonic acoustic oscillation peaks in the two point statistics provides a geometrical test (e.g. Seo & Eisenstein 2003; Percival et al. 2007; Gaztañaga et al. 2009; Reid et al. 2012) and the apparent radial distortions in galaxy clustering caused by gravitationally induced peculiar motions allows to measure the rate at which the density contrast of cosmic structures has been growing. The knowledge of galaxy bias is mandatory to perform such observational test. Notwithstanding, a clustering statistics that is in principle bias-insensitive has been recently proposed by Bel & Marinoni (2014) and applied to VIPERS data (Bel et al. 2014).

Galaxy bias is not just a “nuisance” parameter in the quest for the world model. It also represents an opportunity to constrain models of galaxy evolution as it encodes important information about the physical processes that regulates the evolution of stars and galaxies. For all these reasons it is important to model galaxy bias and to link this quantity to the relevant astrophysical processes. In a recent review, Baugh (2013) has classified galaxy evolution models in two categories. The first is represented by *empirical models* that adopt some theoretically-motivated relation characterised by a set of free parameters to model the galaxy distribution using that of the mass obtained from N -body simulations. The two most popular schemes are halo occupation distribution (HOD, e.g. Cooray & Sheth 2002; Zheng et al. 2005) and sub-halo abundance matching (SHAM, e.g. Vale & Ostriker 2004; Conroy et al. 2006). The second category is represented by *physical models* that actually model the physical processes that regulate the evolution of baryons and their link to the host dark matter structures. This approach is at the heart of the semi-analytic models of galaxy formation (e.g. White & Frenk 1991; Bower et al. 2006; De Lucia & Blaizot 2007). In most cases these models have been compared to estimates of galaxy bias obtained directly from clustering statistics such as the variance in galaxy counts or their spatial 2-point correlation function. Results indicate that current limitations on how well the models can predict these quantities have implications for the ability of constraining dark energy or modified gravity models and the physics of galaxy formation (Contreras et al. 2013).

Alternatively, one can adopt a purely phenomenological approach and use an operational definition of the bias in terms of map between the density fluctuations of mass, δ and that of galaxies, δ_g smoothed on the same scale. This approach assumes that galaxy bias is a local process, i.e. it depends on the local mass density. Many studies further assume that this relation is also linear and deterministic, so that galaxy bias can be quantified by a single parameter b : $\delta_g = b\delta$. The concept of linear bias has played an important role in cosmology and many results have been obtained using this assumption. However it is not physically plausible as it allows negative densities and has no justification neither on the relatively small scales interested by galaxy formation processes that depend on many physical parameters, nor on large scale due to the presence of neutrinos (Villaescusa-Navarro et al. 2014). Galaxy bias is more conveniently described in a probabilistic framework as proposed by Dekel & Lahav (1999) and recently reformulated in the context of the halo model (Cacciato et al. 2012).

Galaxy bias has been extensively investigated from counts in cells statistics, galaxy clustering and weak gravitational lensing. Galaxy clustering is probably the most popular way of determining galaxy bias. This is generally done using 2-point statistics

and under the assumption of linear bias (Norberg et al. 2001, 2002; Zehavi et al. 2005; Coil et al. 2006; Basilakos et al. 2007; Nuza et al. 2012; Arnalte-Mur et al. 2013; Skibba et al. 2013; Marulli et al. 2013). A comparatively smaller number of studies searched for deviations from the linear and deterministic bias either using low order statistics like power spectra (Tegmark & Bromley 1999) or higher order statistics (Verde et al. 2002; Gaztañaga et al. 2005; Kayo et al. 2004; Nishimichi et al. 2007; Swanson et al. 2008) finding conflicting evidences. Gravitational lensing in the weak field regime has also been exploited to study galaxy bias, focusing on nonlinearity, scale-dependence and stochasticity, i.e. the fact that galaxy bias might not be solely determined by the local mass density (Hoekstra et al. 2002; Simon et al. 2007; Jullo et al. 2012; Comparat et al. 2013). However, it should be pointed out that in these studies, the so called stochasticity parameter used to quantify deviations from deterministic bias mixes nonlinearity and stochasticity, making it impossible to disentangle the two effects.

The most natural way to study galaxy bias in a probabilistic framework is by means of counts in cells statistics (Sigad et al. 2000) as it allows to investigate separately deviations from linearity and the presence of an intrinsic scatter in the bias relation. This approach has been used to estimate the bias of galaxies in the PSCz (Branchini 2001), VVDS (Marinoni et al. 2005, hereafter M05) and zCOSMOS (Kovač et al. 2011, hereafter K11) catalogs as well as the relative bias of blue vs. red galaxies in the 2 degrees field galaxy redshift survey [2dFGRS] (Colless et al. 2001; Wild et al. 2005).

Results at low redshift ($z < 0.5$) are rather conflicting. Nevertheless they clearly indicate that, at least for some class of galaxies, the bias is stochastic, scale-dependent and, therefore, non-linear. Also the current situation at $z > 0.5$ is rather confusing. Gravitational lensing studies have either focused on very bright objects to probe the baryonic acoustic oscillations (Comparat et al. 2013), or on galaxies in the COSMOS field (Jullo et al. 2012), finding no evidence for stochasticity but, in the case of Jullo et al. (2012), detecting a significant scale dependence of galaxy bias. This is a serious warning for precision cosmology that indicates the importance of an accurate characterisation of galaxy bias at higher redshift, i.e. in the regions that will be probed by next generation surveys.

Studies based on counts in cells provided different results. M05 analysed galaxies in the VVDS-Deep catalog over an area of 0.4×0.4 deg. and found significant deviations from linearity and an effective linear bias parameter that showed little evolution with redshift. On the other hand the biasing relation of zCOSMOS galaxies measured by K11 over a region of about 1.52 deg.² is close to linear and characterised by a single bias parameter that evolves rapidly with the redshift. The tension between these results is mirrored by the observed differences in the spatial correlation properties of the two samples, with the 2-point correlation function of zCOSMOS galaxies systematically higher than that of VVDS galaxies (see e.g. Meneux et al. 2009). In both cases the volume sampled by the survey is rather small and cosmic variance has been proposed as the likely explanation for the mismatch. The Vimos Public Extragalactic Redshift Survey [VIPERS] (Guzzo et al. 2013) has a depth similar to the zCOSMOS survey but with a much larger area of 24 deg.². Its volume is comparable to that of 2dFGRS at lower redshift and is large enough to significantly reduce the impact of the cosmic variance (see Appendix in Fritz et al. 2014). In this work we adopt the same approach as M05 and K11 and estimate galaxy bias from counts in cells. However, we use a novel estimator that accounts for the effect of discrete sampling, allowing to use

small cells and probe unprecedented small scales that are more affected by the physics of galaxy formation.

The layout of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we describe both the real and mock datasets used in this work. In Section 3 we introduce the formalism used to characterise galaxy bias and the estimators used to measure it from a galaxy redshift survey. In Section 4 we assess the validity of the estimator and use mock galaxy catalogs to gauge random and systematic errors. We present our results in Section 5 and compare them with those of other analyses. The main conclusions are drawn in Section 7

Throughout this paper, we assume a flat Λ CDM universe ($\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda, \sigma_8$) = (0.25; 0.75; 0.9). Galaxy magnitudes are given in the AB system and, unless otherwise stated, computed assuming $h \equiv H_0/100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1} = 1$. σ_8 value. We note, however, that this choice has little impact on our analysis, since our results can be rescaled to different values of σ_8 more consistent with current cosmological constraints. The dependence of the magnitude upon h is expressed as $M = M_h - 5 \log(h)$, where M_h is the absolute magnitude computed for a given h value.

2. Datasets

The results in this paper are based on the first release of the VIPERS galaxy catalog (Garilli et al. 2013). Random and systematic errors have been computed using a set of simulated galaxy catalogs mimicking the real one and its observational selections. Both, the real and the mock samples are described in this Section.

2.1. Real Data

The VIMOS Public Extragalactic Redshift Survey is an on-going ESA Large Programme aimed at measuring spectroscopic redshifts for about 10^5 galaxies at redshift $0.5 < z < 1.2$ and beyond. The galaxy target sample is selected from the ‘T0005’ release of the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope Legacy Survey-Wide (CFHTLS-Wide) optical photometric catalogue⁴. VIPERS covers 24 deg^2 on the sky, divided over two areas within the W1 and W4 CFHTLS fields. Galaxies are selected to a limit of $I_{AB} < 22.5$, further applying a simple and robust colour pre-selection to efficiently remove galaxies at $z < 0.5$. This colour cut and the adopted observing strategy (Scodreggio et al. 2009) allow us to double the galaxy sampling rate with respect to a pure magnitude-limited sample. At the same time, the area and depth of the survey result in a relatively large volume, $5 \times 10^7 h^{-3} \text{ Mpc}^3$, analogous to that of the 2dFGRS at $z \sim 0.1$. VIPERS spectra are collected with the VIMOS multi-object spectrograph (Le Fèvre et al. 2003) at moderate resolution ($R = 210$) using the LR Red grism, providing a wavelength coverage of 5500–9500 Å and a typical radial velocity error of $\sigma_v = 141(1+z) \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The full VIPERS area of 24 deg^2 will be covered through a mosaic of 288 VIMOS pointings. A complete description of the survey construction, from the definition of the target sample to the actual spectra and redshift measurements, is given in Guzzo et al. (2013). The data set used in this and the other papers of the early science release represent the VIPERS Public Data Release 1 (PDR-1) catalog that includes 55359 redshifts (27935 in W1 and 27424 in W4), i.e. 64% of the final survey in terms of covered area (Garilli et al. 2013). A quality flag has been assigned to each object in the process of determining their redshift from the

spectrum, which quantifies the reliability of the measured redshifts. In this analysis, we use only galaxies with flags 2 to 9.5, which corresponds to a sample with a redshift confirmation rate of 90%.

Several observational effects need to be taken into account to investigate the spatial properties of the underlying population of galaxies.

i) Selection effects along the radial direction are driven by the flux limit nature of the survey and, at $z < 0.6$, by the colour pre-selection strategy. In this work we use volume-limited (luminosity-complete) galaxy subsamples that we obtain by selecting galaxies brighter than a given magnitude threshold in a given redshift interval. We have adopted a redshift-dependent luminosity cut of the form $M_B(z) = M_0 - z$ which should account for the luminosity evolution of galaxies (e.g. Zucca et al. 2009). The amplitude of this threshold is set to guarantee that the selected sample is $> 90\%$ complete within the given redshift interval. In this sense each subsample is volume-limited and luminosity-complete. The type of z -dependent luminosity cut is quite popular (see e.g. K11). However, other works have used different types of cuts, either ignoring any dependence on redshift (like in M05, Coil et al. 2008) or have assumed a different functional form (e.g. Arnalte-Mur et al. 2013). Using an incorrect magnitude, i.e. under- or over- correcting for luminosity evolution, would create radial gradient in the density of the objects and induce a spurious z -dependence in the galaxy bias. To minimise the impact of this potential bias, we carry out our analysis in relatively narrow redshift bands, so that adopting any of the aforementioned luminosity cuts would produce similar results, as we verified directly. A proof of this can be found in Figure 13 in which the difference between estimates obtained with a z -dependent cut (filled red dot) and with a z -independent cut (open red dot) are smaller than the total random errors.

Selection effects induced by the colour pre-selection strategy have been determined from the comparison between the spectroscopic and the photometric samples (Guzzo et al. 2013; de la Torre et al. 2013; Fritz et al. 2014) and are accounted for by assigning to each galaxy an appropriate statistical weight dubbed the Colour Sampling Rate (CSR).

ii) The surveyed area presents regular gaps due to the specific footprint of the VIMOS spectrograph that creates a pattern of rectangular regions, called pointings, separated by gaps where no spectra are taken. Superimposed to this pattern there are unobserved areas due to bright stars and to technical and mechanical problems during observations. We will extensively discuss in the following our strategy to take into account this effect in our analysis (we refer the reader to Cucciati et al. 2014, for a more detailed study).

iii) In each pointing, slits are assigned to a number of potential targets which meet the survey selection criteria (Bottini et al. 2005). Given the surface density of the targeted population, the multiplex capability of VIMOS, and the survey strategy, a fraction of about 45% of the parent photometric sample can be assigned to slits. We define the fraction of targets that have a measured spectrum as the Target Sampling Rate (TSR) and the fraction of observed spectra with reliable redshift measurement as the Spectroscopic Sampling Rate (SSR). Both functions are roughly independent from galaxy magnitude except the SSR that decreases for $I_{AB} > 21.0$, as shown in Fig. 12 of Guzzo et al. (2013).

All these selections are thoroughly discussed and quantitatively assessed by de la Torre et al. (2013). In this work we make no attempt to explicitly correct for these effects individually. In-

⁴ <http://terapix.iap.fr/cpltd/oldSite/Descart/CFHTLS-T0005-Release.pdf>

stead, we shall assess their impact on the estimate of galaxy bias in Section 4 using the mock galaxy catalogs described below.

For the scope of our analysis, the main advantages of VIPERS are the relatively dense sampling of tracers, that allows to probe density fluctuations down to scales comparable to those affected by galaxy evolution processes, and the large volume, that allows to reduce considerably the impact of cosmic variance with respect to previous, similar studies of galaxy bias at $z \sim 1$.

The parent PDR-1 VIPERS sample contains 45871 galaxies with reliable redshift measurements. Here we restrict our analysis in the redshift range $z = [0.5, 1.1]$ since the number density of objects at larger distances is too small to allow a robust estimate of galaxy bias. To investigate the possible dependence of galaxy bias on luminosity and redshift we have partitioned the catalog into subsamples by applying a series of cuts in both magnitude and redshift.

The complete list of subsamples considered in this work is presented in Table 1. We have considered three redshift bins ($z = [0.5, 0.7]$, $[0.7, 0.9]$, $[0.9, 1.1]$) and applied different luminosity cuts that we have obtained by compromising between the need of maximising both completeness and number of objects. Different luminosity cuts within each redshift bin will allow to study the luminosity dependence of galaxy bias at different redshifts. The magnitude cuts, $M_B = -19.5 - z - 5 \log(h)$ and $-19.9 - z - 5 \log(h)$ that run across the whole redshift range will be used to investigate a possible evolution of galaxy bias. Subsamples are listed in groups. The first three groups indicate subsamples in the three redshift bins. The last groups indicates subsamples that are designed to match the luminosity cuts performed by K11 ($M_B = -20.5 - z - 5 \log(h = 0.7) = -19.72 - z - 5 \log(h)$) and by M05 ($M_B = -20.0 - 5 \log(h)$). Note that the most conservative cut $M_B = -19.5 - z - 5 \log(h)$ guarantees 90 % completeness out to $z = 1$ for the whole galaxy sample and higher for late type objects (see Fig. 1).

The analysis presented in this work is based on cell counts statistics. A useful figure of merit is therefore represented by the number of independent spheres that can be accommodated within the volume of the survey. Considering intermediate cells with a radius of $6 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$, the number of such independent cells is $N = 3869, 5527, 6964$ in the three redshift interval $z = [0.5, 0.7]$, $[0.7, 0.9]$, $[0.9, 1.1]$, respectively.

2.2. Mock Datasets

In order to assess our ability to measure the mean biasing function and evaluate random and systematic errors we have considered a suite of mock galaxy catalogs mimicking the real PDR-1 VIPERS one.

We have used two different types of mock galaxy catalogs. The first one, on which we have based the bulk of our error analysis, is described in detail in de la Torre et al. (2013). In this set of mocks, synthetic galaxies are obtained by applying the HOD technique to the dark matter halos extracted from the MultiDark N-body simulation (Prada et al. 2012) of a flat Λ CDM universe with $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda, \Omega_b, h, n, \sigma_8) = (0.27; 0.73; 0.0469; 0.7; 0.95; 0.82)$. Since the resolution of the parent simulation was too poor to simulate galaxies in the magnitude range sampled by VIPERS, de la Torre & Peacock (2012) applied an original technique to resample the halo field to generate sub-resolution halos down to a mass of $M \geq 10^{10} h^{-1} M_\odot$. These halos were HOD-populated with mock galaxies by tuning the free parameters to match the spatial 2-point correlation function of VIPERS galaxies (de la Torre et al. 2013). Once populated with HOD galaxies, the various outputs of the computational box have been

Table 1. VIPERS subsamples.

z -range	M_B - cut $M_B - 5 \log(h)$	n_{VIPERS} $10^{-3} h^3 \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$	n_{mock} $10^{-3} h^3 \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$
0.5 - 0.7	$-18.6 - z$	4.78	4.36
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.1 - z$	3.16	2.43
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.5 - z$	2.10	1.37
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.9 - z$	1.24	0.68
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.1 - z$	2.71	2.55
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.5 - z$	1.86	1.47
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.9 - z$	1.07	0.72
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.5 - z$	0.62	0.63
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.9 - z$	0.42	0.43
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.7 - z$	1.64	1.36
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.7 - z$	1.13	1.05
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.7 - z$	0.53	0.53
0.7 - 0.9	-20.0	1.42	1.49

Notes. Col. 1 Redshift range. Col. 2 B-band magnitude cut (computed for $h = 1$). Col 3: Galaxy number density in the real VIPERS sub-catalogs. Col 4: Galaxy number density in the HOD-mock VIPERS sub-catalogs. In the *Parent* mock catalog the number density is a factor ~ 3.7 larger. Counts in cells fully contained in the surveyed volume (i.e. not overlapping with gaps or empty areas) contain ~ 40 % more objects on average.




Fig. 1. Luminosity selection as a function of redshift. The black dots show the W1 and W4 VIPERS galaxies (with spectroscopic redshift flag between 2 and 9.5). Yellow lines represent the principal magnitude cuts applied in every redshift bin. The green line represent the cut $M_0 = -19.7 - z$ made in order to compare our results to those of K11.

rearranged to obtain, respectively, 26 and 31 independent light-cones mimicking the W1 and W4 fields of VIPERS and their geometry. In our analysis we have considered 26 W1+W4 mock samples. They constitute our set of *Parent* mock catalogs, as opposed to the *Realistic* mock catalogs that we obtain from the *Par*

ent ones by applying the various selection effects (VIPERS footprint mask besides TSR, SSR and CSR) and by adding Gaussian errors to the redshifts to mimic the statistical error characterising the measured spectroscopic redshifts. The mock catalogs were built assuming a constant SSR whereas, as we pointed out, this is a declining function of the apparent magnitude. However, the dependence is weak and only affects faint objects, i.e. preferentially objects at large redshifts. For this reason we have decided to explicitly include this dependence by selectively removing objects, starting from the faintest and moving to the brighter, until we match the observed SSR(m) (Guzzo et al. 2013).

The average galaxy number density in the mocks is listed in Column 4 of Table 1. For $z \leq 0.9$ the number density in the mocks is similar or smaller than in the real catalog. The discrepancy increases with the luminosity and probably reflects the limitation in the procedure to HOD-populate halos with bright mock galaxies. The consequence for our analysis is an overestimation of the random errors of the bias of the corresponding VIPERS galaxies. At higher redshift the trend is reversed: the number density of objects in the mocks is systematically larger than in the real catalog. In this case, to avoid underestimating errors, we have randomly diluted the mocks. Hence the perfect match of number densities in the redshift bin $z = [0.9, 1.1]$ shown in the Table.

On the smallest scales investigated in this paper, $R = 4 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$, second-order statistics of the spatial distribution of simulated galaxies in the HOD-mocks, and in particular the variance of the density field, are underestimated by $\sim 10\%$ (Bel et al. 2014). Therefore, to check the robustness of our bias estimate to the galaxy model used to generate the mock catalogs and to the underlying cosmological model, we have considered a second set of mocks. These were obtained from the Millennium N -body simulation (Springel et al. 2005) of a flat Λ CDM universe with $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda, \Omega_b, h, n, \sigma_8) = (0.25; 0.75; 0.045; 0.73; 1.00; 0.9)$ and using the semi-analytic technique of De Lucia & Blaizot (2007), alternative to the HOD one. Due to the limited size of the computational box, it was possible to create light cones with an angular size of $7 \times 1 \text{ deg}^2$, i.e. smaller than the individual W1 and W4 fields. Overall, we have considered 26 + 26 reduced versions of the W1+W4 fields. From these *Realistic* mock catalogs have also been created. However, we performed our analysis on both mock sets only for a few types of VIPERS subsample (one for each redshift shell) to test our ability to measure the biasing function on either types of mocks. These has been done by comparing the errors in the procedure. However, since the Millennium derived mocks are smaller than the real catalog, in the comparison we have excluded cosmic variance from the error budget (see Section 4.4 for details). Since in all cases considered, the errors from the two sets of mocks were quite similar, we shall not mention these mocks further and, for the rest of the paper, fully rely on the error estimates obtained from the HOD-mocks.

3. Theoretical Background

In this section we briefly describe the formalism proposed by Dekel & Lahav (1999) and the method that we use to estimate bias from galaxy counts. The key step is the procedure to estimate the galaxy PDF, $P(\delta_g)$ from the observed probability of galaxy counts in cells, $P(N)$. We review some of the techniques proposed to perform this crucial step and describe in detail the one used in this work.

3.1. Stochastic nonlinear bias

Dekel & Lahav (1999) have proposed a probabilistic approach to galaxy bias in which nonlinearity and stochasticity are treated independently. In this framework galaxy bias is described by the conditional probability of galaxy overdensity, δ_g , given the mass over-density δ : $P(\delta_g|\delta)$. Both quantities are smoothed on the same scale and treated as random fields. If biasing is a local process then $P(\delta_g|\delta)$ fully characterises galaxy bias. Key quantities formed from the conditional probability are the mean biasing function

$$b(\delta) \equiv \langle \delta_g | \delta \rangle = \int P(\delta_g | \delta) \delta_g d\delta_g, \quad (1)$$

and its nontrivial second-order moments

$$\hat{b} \equiv \frac{\langle (b(\delta)\delta^2) \rangle}{\sigma^2} \quad \tilde{b}^2 \equiv \frac{\langle (b(\delta)\delta)^2 \rangle}{\sigma^2}, \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma^2 \equiv \langle \delta^2 \rangle$ is the variance of the mass over-density field on the scale of smoothing. The quantity $\hat{b}$ represents the slope of the linear regression of δ_g against δ and the ratio $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$ measures the nonlinearity of the mean biasing relation. In the limit of linear and deterministic bias the two moments $\hat{b}$ and $\tilde{b}$ coincide with the (constant) mean biasing function $b(\delta) = b_{\text{LIN}}$, where b_{LIN} is the familiar linear bias parameter. Note that $\hat{b}$ is sensitive to the mass variance and scales as $\hat{b} \propto \sigma^{-1}$. On the contrary the moments' ratio is quite insensitive to it, $\tilde{b}/\hat{b} \propto \sigma^{0.15}$ (Sigad et al. 2000). These scaling relations will be used in Section 5 to compare results obtained assuming different values of σ_8 . If bias is nonlinear and deterministic, i.e. in our framework, $\tilde{b}$ is an unbiased estimator for the quantity $b_{\text{var}} \equiv (\sigma_g/\sigma_m)^2$ (Dekel & Lahav 1999), i.e. the bias parameter that is commonly obtained from counts in cells. However, in this work we aim at characterizing galaxy bias from the full galaxy PDF, not just its variance. In this paper we rather focus on $\hat{b}$, a choice that allow us to compare our results with those of K11 (but not with M05, in which the focus is instead on $\tilde{b}$). Fortunately, as we shall see, the small degree of nonlinearity, makes these two choices almost equivalent.

If bias is deterministic, then it is fully characterised by the mean biasing function $b(\delta)\delta$. However, we do not expect this to be the case since galaxy formation and evolution are regulated by complex physical processes that are not solely determined by the local mass density. Therefore, for a given value of δ there will be a whole distribution of δ_g about the mean $b(\delta)\delta$. This scatter, often referred to as bias stochasticity, is contributed by two sources: the physical process that determines the formation and evolution of galaxies and the shot noise derived from sampling an underlying continuous density field with a discrete set of tracers. It turns out that for the typical galaxy number density in redshift surveys the shot noise contribution largely dominates the scatter except in regions of high density that represent a small fraction of the survey volume and that we ignore in our analysis (Szapudi & Pan 2004). For this reason, in the rest of the paper we shall then make the simplifying assumption that shot noise is the only source of stochasticity. Ultimately, the validity of this assumption can only be tested observationally. Unfortunately, as anticipated in the introduction, the observational estimates of bias stochasticity currently provide conflicting evidence.

3.2. Direct estimate of $b(\delta)\delta$

Under the hypothesis that bias is deterministic and monotonic then the mean biasing function, $b(\delta)\delta$, can be estimated by com-

paring the PDFs of the mass and of the galaxy over-density. Let $C(\delta) = P(> \delta)$ and $C_g(\delta_g) = P(> \delta_g)$ be the *cumulative* probability distribution functions [CDFs] obtained by integrating the PDFs of, respectively, mass and galaxies. Then monotonicity guarantees that the ranking of the fluctuations δ and δ_g is preserved. In this case $b(\delta)\delta$ can be obtained by equating the two CDFs at the same percentile:

$$b(\delta) = C_g^{-1}(C(\delta)), \quad (3)$$

where C_g^{-1} indicates the inverse function of C_g .

Equation 3 provides a practical recipe to estimate galaxy bias from observed counts in cells of a given size. It requires three ingredients: an estimate of the galaxy over-density δ_g , its PDF and the PDFs of the mass over-density. The simplest way of estimating δ_g is from discrete counts in a cell, N_g , through

$$1 + \delta_g = N_g / \langle N_g \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\langle N_g \rangle$ represents mean over all counts. From Eq. 4 one can form the galaxy PDF, $P(\delta_g)$, from the count probability $P(N_g)$. The biasing function can then be obtained by comparing $C_g(\delta_g)$ with a model $C(\delta)$.

This simple recipe has been used by several authors (Sigad et al. 2000; Branchini 2001; Marinoni et al. 2005; Viel et al. 2005; Kovač et al. 2011). It is based on assumptions that are only approximately valid and, therefore, should be carefully checked when applied to real samples. One issue is shot noise. Galaxy densities estimated from counts through Eq. 4 are affected by shot noise. This induces a non-physical stochasticity in the bias relation, in contrast with the hypothesis of deterministic biasing. Stochasticity affects the estimate of $b(\delta)\delta$ from Equation 3, especially at large values of δ_g , where the CDF flattens and the evaluation of the inverse function C_g^{-1} becomes noisier. Another issue is the accuracy of the model for the mass PDF for which no simple theoretical model is available. Finally, galaxy over-densities are computed using the redshift of the objects (which includes peculiar velocities) rather than distances computed from the cosmological redshifts (which represent only recession velocities). This induces a systematic differences between densities evaluated in real and redshift space which, in the linear regime, has been quantified by Kaiser (1987).

All these issues potentially affect the estimate of galaxy bias and should be properly accounted for. In the next Section we will review some existing estimators, that improve the simple method outlined above, designed to minimise the impact of the shot noise and propose a new one that we shall apply in this paper. In particular, we propose a new strategy to estimate galaxy bias and test its performance in Section 4.

3.3. From $P(N_g)$ to $P(\delta_g)$

The probability of galaxy counts, $P(N_g)$, can be expressed as

$$P(N_g) = \int_{-1}^{+\infty} P(\delta_g) P(N_g | \delta_g) d\delta_g, \quad (5)$$

where the conditional probability function $P(N_g | \delta_g)$ specifies the way in which discrete galaxies sample the underlying, continuous field. The common assumption that galaxies are a local Poisson process implies that

$$P(N_g | \delta_g) = \frac{[\langle N_g \rangle (1 + \delta_g)]^{N_g} e^{-\langle N_g \rangle (1 + \delta_g)}}{N_g!}. \quad (6)$$

Deviations from the Poisson hypothesis can in principle be taken into account by adopting a different form for $P(N_g | \delta_g)$. Different strategies have been proposed to obtain $P(\delta_g)$ from $P(N_g)$ inverting Equation 5:

- *Richardson-Lucy deconvolution*. Szapudi & Pan (2004) have proposed this iterative, nonparametric method to reconstruct $P(\delta_g)$ by comparing the observed $P(N_g)$ to the one computed from Eq. 5 at each step of the iteration, starting from an initial guess for $P(\delta_g)$.
- *Skewed Lognormal Model Fit*. This parametric method was also implemented by Szapudi & Pan (2004). One assumes a skewed lognormal form for $P(\delta_g)$ and then determines the four free parameter of the model by minimising the difference between Eq. 5 and the observed $P(N_g)$.
- *Gamma expansion* [Γ_E]. Among the various form proposed to model the galaxy density field, the Gamma expansion, defined by expanding the Gamma distribution on a basis of Laguerre polynomials (Mustapha & Dimitrakopoulos 2010) is a PDF which appears to capture the essential features of the galaxy density field. Interestingly, the expansion coefficients directly depend on the moments of the observed counts. Because of this, the full shape of the galaxy PDF can be recovered directly from the observed $P(N_g)$ with no need to integrate Eq. 5.

Szapudi & Pan (2004) have tested the ability of the first two methods in reconstructing the PDF of halos and mock galaxies obtained from N -body simulations. They showed that a successful reconstruction can be obtained even when the sampling is as sparse as $\langle N_g \rangle \geq 0.1$, which is a factor of 3 smaller than the mean density in the sparsest VIPERS sub-sample considered in this work. Bel, J. *et al.* (in preparation) have extensively tested the Gamma expansion method [Γ_E -method] and showed, using the same mock catalogs as in this paper, that this method reconstructs the PDF of a VIPERS-like galaxy distribution with an accuracy superior to that of the other methods. This comes at the price of discarding counts in cells that overlap the observed areas by less than 60 %: a constraint that guarantees the validity of the local Poisson sampling hypothesis.

To illustrate the performance of the Γ_E -method we plot, in Figure 2, the galaxy PDFs Γ_E -reconstructed from the 25 *Realistic* mock VIPERS subsamples with galaxies brighter than $M_B = -19.1 - z - 5 \log(h)$ in the range $z = [0.7, 0.9]$. The blue dashed curve represents the mean among the mocks and the blue band the $1-\sigma$ scatter. The reconstruction is compared with the “reference” PDF (solid, red line) obtained by averaging over the PDFs reconstructed, with the same Γ_E -method, from the *Parent* mock catalogs. We regard this as the “reference” PDF since, as shown by Szapudi & Pan (2004) and checked by us, when the sampling is large, all the aforementioned reconstruction methods recover the PDF of the mass, the $P(N_g)$ and the biasing function estimated in the simulation very accurately. In the plot we show $P(1+\delta)(1+\delta)$ to highlight the low- and high- density tails, where the reconstruction is more challenging. The reconstructed PDF underestimates the reference one in the low and high density tails and overestimates it at $\delta \sim 0$. Systematic deviations in the low and high density tails are to be expected since the probability of finding halos, and therefore mock galaxies, in these regimes significantly deviates from the one expected for a Poisson distribution. The excess probability of finding halos in high density regions generates over-dispersion (Somerville et al. 2001; Casas-Miranda et al. 2002). However, these differences are well within the $1-\sigma$ uncertainty strip. We further point out that the




Fig. 2. Reconstructed PDF of the mock VIPERS galaxies measured in cells of $R = 4 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ (bottom panel) and $R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ (top panel). The red, solid curve represents the reference galaxy PDF obtained by averaging over the PDFs reconstructed from the *Parent* mocks using the Γ_E -method. The blue dashed curve shows the average PDF reconstructed from the *Realistic* mocks using the Γ_E -method. The blue-shaded region represents the $1\text{-}\sigma$ scatter among the 25 *Realistic* mocks. We plot $P(1 + \delta)(1 + \delta)$ to highlight the performance of the reconstruction at high and low over-densities. Note that the different Y-ranges in the two panels.

case shown here refers to a quite challenging PDF reconstruction of a rather sparse sample of mock galaxies. The scatter for cells of $R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ is larger than for $R = 4 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ and is driven by the limited number of independent cells rather than sparse sampling.

The Γ_E -method used to reconstruct the galaxy PDF from discrete counts is implemented as follows:

- We consider as input dataset one of the volume-limited, luminosity complete subsample listed in Table 1. The position of each object in the catalog is specified in redshift space, i.e. by its angular position and measured spectroscopic redshift.
- Spherical cells are thrown at random positions within the surveyed region. We consider cells with radii $R = 4, 6$, and $8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. The smallest radius is set to guarantee at least 0.3 counts, on average. The largest radius is set to have enough cell statistics to sample $P(N_g)$ at large N_g . We only consider cells that overlap by more than 60 % with the observed areas. This constraint is set to guarantee that the conditional probability function in Eq. 6 is well approximated by a Poisson distribution (Bel & Marinoni 2014). From counts in cells we compute the probability function $P(N_g)$.
- Under the assumption of local Poisson sampling we use the measured $P(N_g)$ and its moments to model the galaxy PDF with the Γ_E -method that we compute using all factorial moments up to the sixth order.

3.4. and from $P(\delta_g)$ to $b(\delta)\delta$.

In order to recover the mean biasing function from the galaxy PDF one has to solve Equation 3. To do this we assume that the mean biasing function is monotonic and deterministic and that a reliable model for the mass PDF is available. Despite its conceptual simplicity, the procedure to recover the biasing function requires several nontrivial steps that we describe here. The uncertainties introduced in each step will be estimated in the next Section. The procedure is as follows:

- We assume a model PDF for the mass density field in redshift space. Rather than adopt an approximated model, we measure the mass PDF directly from a dark matter only N -body simulation with the same cosmological parameters as the Millennium run (Springel et al. 2005). Note that this is not the cosmological model used to build the HOD-mock VIPERS catalogs. Using a plausible but incorrect model introduces some extra uncertainties that can also affect the analysis of the real data. This additional uncertainty is expected to have a negligible impact on our analysis since the nonlinear bias parameter $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$ is largely independent of the underlying cosmology and the parameter $\hat{b}$ is mostly sensitive to σ (Sigad et al. 2000).
- We use Eq. 3 to estimate the mean biasing function from the mass and galaxy PDFs.
- We estimate the maximum δ at which the reconstruction of $b(\delta)\delta$ can be considered reliable. The value of δ_{Max} is determined by comparing the observed $P(N_g)$ with the same quantity predicted from the galaxy PDF through Equation 5. The match is considered satisfactory if the discrepancy is within the $2\text{-}\sigma$ errors estimated from the mocks and δ_{Max} is set at the maximum over-density at which the previous condition is still satisfied. In fact this procedure provides the maximum value of δ_g , not δ . The corresponding maximum value of δ is obtained from the mean biasing function that we have reconstructed.
- We estimate the second-order moments $\hat{b}$ and $\tilde{b}$ and their ratio by integrating over all δ up to δ_{Max} .

4. Error sources

In this Section we review all possible sources of uncertainty that might affect the recovery of the biasing function and we estimate errors using mock catalogs. In this process we need to consider a reference biasing function to compare the results of the reconstruction with. This could be estimated directly from the distribution of the dark matter particles and mock galaxies within the simulation box. Szapudi & Pan (2004) showed that when the sampling is dense, the biasing function (of both dark matter halos and simulated galaxies) reconstructed with both the Richardson-Lucy and the skewed lognormal fit methods matches the one measured in the computational box. We have checked that, when the sampling is as dense as in our *Parent* mock catalogs, the Γ_E -method performs just as well as the previous two. Hence, we use as a reference biasing function the one obtained from the *Parent* mocks

4.1. Sensitivity to the galaxy PDF reconstruction method

Most of the previous estimates of the mean biasing function were based on a direct estimate of δ_g from the observed counts N_g , making no attempt to account for shot noise directly. This simplistic procedure can hamper the recovery of $b(\delta)\delta$ when the




Fig. 3. Mean biasing function of mock VIPERS galaxies computed from counts in cells of $R = 4 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ (bottom panel) and $R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ (top panel). The magnitude cut and redshift range of the mock VIPERS subsample, indicated in the plot, are the same as Figure 2. Solid, red curve: reference biasing function. Blue, dashed curve and blue-shaded region: average value and $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter of the biasing function reconstructed from the *Realistic* mocks using the Γ_E -method. Brown, dot-dashed curve and orange-shaded band: average value and $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter of the biasing function reconstructed from the *Realistic* mocks using a ‘direct’ estimate of the galaxy PDF.

sampling is sparse. To estimate errors induced by shot noise and quantify the benefit of using the Γ_E -method we have compared the biasing functions reconstructed using both procedures. The result of this exercise is shown in Figure 3. The red curve represents the reference biasing function obtained by averaging among the *Parent* mocks. Individual biasing functions in the mocks were obtained using the galaxy PDF reconstructed with the Γ_E -method. The blue dashed curve represents the same quantity obtained from the 25 *Realistic* mocks. The blue band represents the $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter among the mocks. For negative values of δ_g the reconstructed biasing function is below the reference one, but the trend is reversed for $\delta_g > 0$, reflecting the mismatch among the reconstructed and the reference PDFs in Figure 2. The discrepancy, however, is well within the scatter. On the contrary, the biasing function obtained from the “direct” estimate of δ_g (brown, dot-dashed curve and corresponding $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter, orange band) is significantly different from the reference function. The discrepancy increases at low densities and for small spheres, i.e. when the counts per cell decrease and the shot noise is large.

4.2. Sensitivity to the mass PDF

Another key ingredient of the mass reconstruction is the mass PDF. In principle this quantity could be obtained from galaxy peculiar velocities or gravitational lensing. However, in practice, errors are large and would need to be averaged out over scales

much larger than the size of the cells considered here. For this reason we need to rely on theoretical modelling. Coles & Jones (1991); Kofman et al. (1994) have shown that the mass PDF can be approximated by a lognormal distribution. Indeed this model has been adopted in previous reconstructions of the biasing function (e.g. M05, Wild et al. (2005), K11).

However, the lognormal approximation is known to perform poorly in the high and low density tails and for certain spectra of density fluctuations. An improvement over the lognormal model is represented by the skewed lognormal distribution (Colombi 1994). This model proved to be an excellent approximation to the PDF of the dark matter measured from N -body experiments over a wide range of scales and of over-densities (Ueda & Yokoyama 1996). The impact of adopting either models for the mass PDF can be appreciated in Fig. 4. The solid red curves represents the same biasing functions shown in Fig. 3 obtained from the galaxy PDFs of the *Parent* mocks and from a mass PDF obtained directly from an N -body simulation with the same cosmological parameter and size as the Millennium simulation using the output corresponding to $z = 0.8$. Like in the previous test we consider the red, solid curve as the reference biasing function. The brown, dot-dashed curve shows the mean biasing function reconstructed assuming a lognormal model for the mass PDF, i.e. a lognormal fit to the PDF measured from the N -body simulation. The curve represents the average among 25 mocks and the orange band is the $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter. The resulting biasing function is systematically below the reference at $\delta_g \sim 0$ for cells with $R = 4 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$, and systematically above in deep voids for cells with $R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. In both cases the mismatch is comparable, or larger, than $2\text{-}\sigma$. The blue, dashed curve represents the mean biasing function reconstructed assuming a skewed lognormal model for the mass PDF together with its $2\text{-}\sigma$ uncertain strip (blue band). In this case agreement is excellent.

We conclude that, for the practical purpose of reconstructing galaxy bias the mass PDF measured from N -body data and a skewed lognormal fit perform equally well. The main advantage of using the latter would be the possibility of determining experimentally the four parameters of the fit. Since, however, the parameters are poorly constrained by observations, we decide, in this work, to use directly the mass PDFs obtained from an N -body simulation. As a consequence, our estimate of the biasing function is model dependent. However, the dependency is mainly on the *rms* mass density fluctuation, and we know the approximate scaling of the relevant bias parameters, $\hat{b}$, $\tilde{b}$ and their ratio, on σ_8 . With this respect, it is worth noticing that the mass PDF used to obtain the biasing functions in Figure 4 is not the *true* one since it is obtained from an N -body simulation that uses a cosmological model, namely a value of σ_8 , different from the one used to produce the mock catalogs. While this has no effect on the test presented here, we prefer to maintain this mismatch since it best represents the case of the real analysis in which one does not know the underlying cosmological model.

4.3. Sensitivity to redshift distortions

Galaxy positions are measured in redshift space, i.e. using the observed redshift to estimate the distance of the objects. The presence of peculiar velocities induces apparent radial anisotropies in the spatial distribution of galaxies and, as a consequence, modifies the local density estimate and their PDF (Kaiser 1987). However, our goal is to reconstruct the mean biasing function in *real space*, i.e. free of redshift space distortions. One way of tackling the problem is to recover the mean bias-




Fig. 4. Solid, red curve: reference mean biasing function of Fig. 3 computed using the mass PDF from N -body simulations. Brown, dot-dashed curve and orange band: biasing function obtained using a lognormal fit to the mass PDF and $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter from the mocks. Blue, dashed curve and blue band: biasing function obtained using a skewed lognormal fit to the mass PDF and $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter from the mocks.

ing function from the galaxy and mass PDF *both* measured in redshift space, with the idea that peculiar velocities induce similar distortions in the spatial distribution of both dark matter and galaxies so that they cancel out when estimating the mean biasing relation from Eq. 3. In the limit of Gaussian field, linear perturbation theory and no velocity bias, the cancelation is exact. However, nonlinear effects have a different impact on the mass and galaxy density fields and induce different distortions in their respective PDFs. To assess the impact of nonlinear effects we have compared the mean biasing function reconstructed from PDFs estimated in real and redshift space.

The results are shown in Figure 5. The solid, red curve represents the mean biasing function of galaxies in the *Realistic* mock catalogs estimated using the PDFs of galaxy and mass in real space. The blue dashed line shows the same function determined in redshift space. Both curves are obtained by averaging over the 25 mocks and the blue band represents the $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter in redshift space. The biasing function computed in redshift space underestimates the galaxy density in low density regions and overestimates it in high density environments, i.e. in the presence of nonlinear flows. The difference is systematic but its amplitude is within the $2\text{-}\sigma$ errors of the reconstruction. We note that this is a demanding test, since we have considered the smallest cells of $4 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ thus probing scales where deviations from linear motions are larger. Indeed the agreement between biasing functions in real and redshift space further improves with the size of the cell. For this reason we decide to carry out our analysis in redshift space making no attempt to correct the measured galaxy PDF for redshift distortions.




Fig. 5. Mean biasing function estimated in real space (solid, red curve) and redshift space (dashed blue curve and its $2\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainty band). Counts are performed in spherical cells with a radius of $4 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. The luminosity cut and the redshift range is indicated in each panel. The width of each band represents the scatter among mocks.

4.4. Error estimate

Different sources of errors affect the recovery of the biasing function. One is cosmic variance due to the finite volume of the sample. This source dominates the error budget of the M05 and K11 analyses and hampers the possibility of recovering the “cosmological” biasing function. The other sources are the shot noise induced by discrete sampling and the limited number of independent cells used to build the probability of galaxy counts $P(N_g)$. In the VIPERS survey, which is based on a single-pass strategy, sparse sampling is more of an issue than in the M05 and K11 cases. The cumulative effect of the single pass strategy and colour pre-selection reduces the sampling rate to $\sim 35\%$ on average, with significant variations across quadrants. The survey geometry, characterised by gaps and missing quadrants that occupy $\sim 25\%$ of the would-be continuous field, further dilutes the sampling (we consider cells that overlap up to 40% with unobserved regions) and limits the number of independent cells that can be accommodated within the survey. Our PDF reconstruction strategy is designed to minimise these effects that, nevertheless, induce random and systematic errors that need to be estimated. We do this with the help of both the *Parent* and *Realistic* mock catalogs. The former will provide the reference mean biasing function. Errors are estimated by comparing the bias function reconstructed from the *Realistic* mocks to the reference one. The procedure is detailed below and the results are summarised in Table 2.

4.4.1. Total random error

To estimate the total random error σ_{RND} , we proceed as follows. We reconstruct the mean biasing function in each of the *Realistic* mock catalogs, compute the average over the 25 mocks and, finally, estimate the scatter around this average. The *rms* scatter provides an estimate of the total random error. This error is contributed by both cosmic variance and all sources of uncertainties (shot noise, limited count statistics) that may affect the recovery of the biasing function. Total random errors for $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}/\hat{b}$ are listed in columns 6 and 10 of Table 2, respectively.

4.4.2. Cosmic variance

To assess the contribution of the cosmic variance, σ_{CV} , to the error budget we proceed as for the estimate of total random errors using, however, the *Parent* catalogs rather than the *Realistic* ones. Since errors in the bias reconstruction are mainly driven by discrete sampling and, in the *Parent* catalogs the sampling is dense, the *rms* scatter among these mocks is dominated by cosmic variance. Total cosmic variance contribution to errors in $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}/\hat{b}$ are listed in columns 7 and 11 of Table 2, respectively. It turns out that the contribution of the cosmic variance is of the same order than that of the sparse sampling but, unlike in the case of M05 and K11, it does not dominate the error budgets.

4.4.3. Systematic errors

Following K11, we compute systematic errors, σ_{SYS} as the average offset from zero of the bias estimates in the *Realistic* and the *Parent* catalogs, i.e. $\sigma_{\text{SYS}} = \langle X_{\text{Realistic}} - X_{\text{Parent}} \rangle$, where X is either $\hat{b}$ or $\hat{b}/\hat{b}$ and the mean is over the 25 pairs of mocks. The systematic errors are listed in columns 8 and 12 of Table 2, respectively. We note that they are of the same order than the random ones. Their amplitude is similar to that of the analogous errors estimated by K11 (upper part of their Table 2) in the significantly smaller zCOSMOS sample. As these errors do not seem to depend on the volume of the survey, we conclude that they can be regarded as genuinely systematic. Systematic errors on $\hat{b}$ are on average positive, meaning that the mean slope of the reconstructed biasing function typically overestimates the true one. As for the nonlinear parameter, systematic errors are preferentially negative, indicating that the reconstruction procedure has the tendency to underestimate the nonlinearity of the biasing function.

4.4.4. The value of δ_{Max}

We defined δ_{Max} as the maximum value of δ at which the difference between the measured and the reconstructed probability counts $P(N_g)$ is significant. One could just then compare the difference between the two functions with the *rms* scatter among the mocks. However, considering the mismatch in the number density of galaxies in the mock and real VIPERS catalog at high redshift we decided to take a more conservative approach and to proceed as follows. First, we estimate the errors on the reconstructed $P(N_g)$ from the *Realistic* mocks and consider the $2\text{-}\sigma$ rather than the $1\text{-}\sigma$ scatter to gauge discrepancies. Then we search for the largest values of N_g at which either of these two conditions is violated: (i) the difference between the measured and predicted values of $P(N_g)$ is less than $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter in the mocks, (ii) the fractional difference between the observed and the predicted $P(N_g)$ is less than 50 %. The maximum N_g

is then transformed into a maximum galaxy over-density using $\delta_{g,\text{Max}} = N_{g,\text{Max}} / \langle N_{g,\text{Max}} \rangle - 1$. Finally $\delta_{g,\text{Max}}$ is converted into the maximum mass over-density, δ_{Max} , using the estimated mean biasing function.

5. Results

In this section we present the results of our analysis, focusing on the dependence of the mean biasing function and its moments. In Sections 5.1 and 5.2 we explore the bias dependence on magnitude and redshifts, respectively. In both cases we fix the radius of the cell equal to $6 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. The dependence on the cell size is investigated in Section 5.3. All results, referring to all possible combinations of redshift range, magnitude cut and cell size are summarised in Table 2.

As we shall see the shape of the mean biasing functions of VIPERS galaxies is qualitatively similar to that in the VIPERS mocks. This is very reassuring as it justifies *a posteriori* the use of mock catalogs designed to match the 2-point correlation properties of the VIPERS galaxies also for a galaxy bias analysis. The VIPERS biasing function is also in qualitative agreement with that of M05 and K11, at least up to moderate values of δ . For $\delta < 0$ the function is nonlinear, very steep and vanishes below a minimum value δ_{TH} . For $\delta \geq 0$ the biasing function is close to linear all the way up to δ_{Max} . The behaviour at $\delta < 0$ has been interpreted as the result of a decreasing efficiency of galaxy formation with δ and as an evidence for a mass density threshold, δ_{TH} , below which galaxies do not form at all. The analyses of M05 and K11 suggest that at large δ the linearity breaks down again and the bias function flattens, leading to anti-bias. This feature has been variously interpreted as an evidence for quenching processes (Blanton et al. 2000), enhanced galaxy merging rate (Marinoni et al. 2005) and early galaxy formation (Yoshikawa et al. 2001) in high density regions. We find no evidence for such flattening.

5.1. Magnitude dependence

The different solid curves in Figure 6 represent the mean biasing function of VIPERS galaxies reconstructed from counts in cells of radius $6 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ for different magnitude cuts against $1 + \delta_g$ and for three different redshift shells (the three panels). We prefer to use $1 + \delta_g$ both to ease the comparison with similar plots in the literature and to highlight deviations from linearity in the low density regions. The bands associated to each curve represent the $2\text{-}\sigma$ random scatter computed from the *Realistic* mocks.

The magnitude range that we are able to explore is set by competing constraints: the faint limit reflects the requirement of maximising the completeness of the sample whereas the bright limit is set by requiring an average of at least 0.3 objects per cell. As a result the size of the magnitude range shrinks with the redshift: at $z = [0.5, 0.7]$ it spans a range $\Delta M_B = 1.4$ whereas at $z = [0.9, 1.1]$ $\Delta M_B = 0.5$.

In the two upper plots the curves corresponding to the different magnitude cuts are well separated for $\delta_g < 0$. The value of δ_{TH} significantly increases with luminosity; a trend that was already observed by M05 and, with less significance, by K11. This dependency suggests that bright objects preferentially form in higher density environments. Differences among the curves are also seen at large over densities, where the slope seems to increase with luminosity. However, the significance of trend is less than $2\text{-}\sigma$. At $z \geq 0.9$ we do not detect any significant luminosity dependence. This is not surprising since, at these redshifts, we




Fig. 6. Mean biasing function of VIPERS galaxies from counts in cells of radius $6 h^{-1}$ Mpc as a function of the B-band magnitude cut in three redshift ranges indicated in each panel. Curves with different colours and line-styles corresponds to the different magnitude cuts indicated in upper panel. Bands with matching colours represent the associated $2\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainty intervals estimated from the mocks.

are able to study galaxy bias only in a narrow range of luminosity.

These results are robust to variations in the size of the cells in the range $R = [4, 8] h^{-1}$ Mpc (see Table 2). and confirm the magnitude dependence of galaxy bias detected in various galaxy samples and different redshifts from galaxy clustering (e.g. Norberg et al. 2002; Zehavi et al. 2005; Pollo et al. 2006; Coil et al. 2008; Skibba et al. 2013; Arnalte-Mur et al. 2013; Marulli et al. 2013), gravitational lensing (e.g. Coupon et al. (2012)) and counts in cells (e.g. M05 and K11).

Figure 7 shows the second-order moments $\hat{b}$ (left panels) and $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$ (right panels) of the biasing functions shown in Fig. 6. The same colour-code is used to indicate the magnitude cuts. Parameters have been computed at the value of δ_{Max} listed in Table 2 and assuming $\sigma_8 = 0.9$. Error bars represent $1\text{-}\sigma$ total random uncertainties estimated from the *Realistic* mocks (see Table 2). These plots provide a more quantitative estimate of the magnitude dependence of galaxy bias. There is a clear trend for $\hat{b}$ increasing with luminosity, especially in the lower redshift bin where the magnitude interval that we can probe is larger. The significance of the dependence is $\sim 1.5\sigma$, decreasing to $\sim 1\sigma$ at $z = [0.7, 0.9]$. No significant luminosity dependence is detected in the outer redshift shell where, however, the magnitude interval is only $\Delta M_B = 0.5$. We show results only for cells of $6 h^{-1}$ Mpc but the same trend is detected at 4 and $8 h^{-1}$ Mpc.

The right-end panels show the nonlinear parameter $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$. Values that differ from unity indicate deviations from linear bias (horizontal dashed line). A small but significant degree of non-linearity is present at all redshifts. We do not detect any significant dependence on luminosity except, perhaps, at low redshifts, where nonlinearity seems to anti-correlate with luminosity. Results do not change significantly if we use cells of different size.




Fig. 7. Second-order moments of the mean biasing functions shown in Fig. 6. Left panels: mean slope $\hat{b}$. Right panels: nonlinear parameter $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$. Error bars indicate $1\text{-}\sigma$ scatter from the mocks. The redshift ranges and the colour code are the same used in Fig. 6. Magnitude cuts are indicated in the plots. All values have been computed assuming $\sigma_8 = 0.9$. The horizontal dashed line is plotted for reference and represents the case of no bias (left hand plot) and that of linear bias (right hand panels).

On a closer inspection, the mean biasing function of the brightest objects in the range $z = [0.9, 1.1]$, i.e. the orange band in the bottom panel of Fig. 6, exhibits some irregularities for $\delta > 3$. This is the fingerprint of an imperfect PDF reconstruction which typically arises from sampling large over-densities with a limited number of independent cells. The effect is only seen at large redshifts and for bright magnitude cuts i.e. when the sampling is sparser. While this effect modifies the shape of the mean biasing function, its impact on the estimated values of the second moments $\hat{b}$ and $\tilde{b}$ and, especially, $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$, is small. The reason is that bias moments are integral quantities estimated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{b}(\delta') &= \sigma^{-2} \int_{-1}^{\delta'} b(\delta) \delta^2 P(\delta) d\delta, \\ \tilde{b}(\delta') &= \sigma^{-2} \int_{-1}^{\delta'} (b(\delta) \delta)^2 P(\delta) d\delta.\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

The integral is weighted by the mass PDF which peaks at $\delta \sim 0$ and rapidly approaches zero in the high and low density tails. Systematic errors in the bias reconstruction at large over-densities are suppressed when computing $\hat{b}$ and $\tilde{b}$ and then washed out when computing their ratio. The spurious features that we see in the biasing functions of the VIPERS galaxies at $z = [0.9, 1.1]$ at large over density are not expected to affect the estimate of $\hat{b}$, $\tilde{b}$ and their ratio in a significant way.

Fig. 8 demonstrates the validity this hypothesis. In the left panels we show the values of $\hat{b}(\delta)$, computed from equation 7. Curves with different line-styles refer to the different magnitude cuts indicated in the plot. Bands with matching colours indicate the $1\text{-}\sigma$ scatter from the mocks. We notice that in the interval




Fig. 8. Left: second-order moment $\hat{b}(\delta)$ of the reconstructed mean biasing functions shown in Fig. 6. The cell size is $R = 6 \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. Different line-styles and colours indicate different luminosity cuts listed in the plot. The redshift ranges and colour code are the same as in Fig. 6. The width of the bands represents the $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter among the mocks. Right: similar plots showing the nonlinear bias parameter $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}(\delta)$.

$z = [0.9, 1.1]$ and for the brightest (sparsest) sample, the $\hat{b}(\delta)$ flattens for $\delta > 3$, well below the value of $\delta_{\text{MAX}} = 12.2$. Analogous considerations hold for the non-linear parameter curve $\hat{b}$, $\tilde{b}(\delta)$ shown in the right panels. These results do not significantly depend on the size of the cells.

5.2. Redshift dependence

To explore the bias dependence on the redshift we have selected a galaxy population brighter than $M_B = -19.5 - z - 5\log(h)$ and estimated its mean biasing function in the usual three redshift bins. This z -dependent magnitude cut is designed to account for luminosity evolution (Zucca et al. 2009), so that differences in the galaxy bias measured in the different z -bins can be interpreted as the result of a genuine evolution. The results of our analysis are shown in Figure 9. The plots are analogous to those of Fig. 6 and use the same symbols, colour scheme, line-style but consider cells of all sizes.

The biasing function shows little or no evolution in the range $z = [0.5, 0.9]$, as demonstrated by the proximity between the dashed-blue ($z = [0.5, 0.7]$) and dot-dashed, orange ($z = [0.7, 0.9]$) curve and the overlap of their $1\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainty bands. The red, solid line however, is well separated from the others, indicating that galaxy bias evolves significantly beyond $z = 0.9$. This evolution is detected both in low- and high-density environments. In the low density range the fact that δ_{TH} increases significantly with the redshift indicates that the evolution shifts galaxy formation from high to lower density regions. This process is particularly evident for $z > 0.9$. At $\delta > 0$ the effect of evolution is that of steepening the slope of the biasing function. Since in this range the biasing is close to linear, this means that galaxy bias increases with redshift, confirming the results of sev-




Fig. 9. Mean biasing function of VIPERS galaxies with $M_B < -19.5 - z - 5\log(h)$ measured in different redshift bins, characterised by different colours and line-styles, as indicated in the plot. The width of each band represents the $2\text{-}\sigma$ scatter in the mocks. The three panels refer to different cell sizes with radii $R = 4, 6, 8 \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ from top to bottom.

eral independent analyses (see Section 6). The same trends are evident in all panels, indicating that the bias evolution is similar on all scales explored.

The biasing function of the objects at high redshifts and with $R = 8 \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ (red curve in the bottom panel) is characterised, at moderate values of δ , by some irregularities. As discussed in the previous sections, these are spurious features that reflect the inaccuracies in the recovery of the galaxy PDF. Even in this case, we have verified that they have no significant impact on the recovered values of $\hat{b}$ and $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$. Moreover, it is reassuring that these anomalies are only seen at high redshifts and for large values of R , confirming the fact that they are induced by poor sampling of the high- N_g tail of the count probability due to limited statistics. These two facts make us confident that bias evolution is a genuine feature.

Fig. 10 shows the values of $\hat{b}$ and $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$ as a function of the redshift. The values have been obtained by integrating the mean biasing functions in Figure 9 out to the values δ_{MAX} listed in Table 2. The colour code used for the symbols is the same as in Figure 9 and it is indicated in the plot. The mean slope of the curve, $\hat{b}$ (left panels), increases significantly beyond $z = 0.9$ whereas we see little or no evolution at lower redshifts. This confirms in a more quantitative way the qualitative analysis of Figure 9. The same trend is seen at all redshifts and at all scales, indicating that the bias evolution at $z > 0.9$ is indeed a robust feature. The bias parameter of VIPERS galaxies brighter than $M_B = -19.9 - z - 5\log(h)$ exhibits a small but significant degree of nonlinearity at all redshifts and scales explored in our analysis (right panels). However, unlike for $\hat{b}$, we do not detect a significant evolution of the bias nonlinearity. These results are robust to the luminosity cut since they are also found for galaxies brighter than $M_B < -19.9 - z - 5\log(h)$.




Fig. 10. Moments of the mean biasing functions shown in Fig. 9. Panels from top to bottom indicate cells of increasing size. Left panels: $\hat{b}$. Right panels: $\hat{b}/\bar{b}$. Error bars indicate the $1\text{-}\sigma$ scatter from the mocks. All values have been computed assuming $\sigma_8 = 0.9$.

5.3. Scale dependence

In Fig. 11 we explore the dependence of the bias of VIPERS galaxies on the radius of the cells down to a scale of $4 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. In the plots we show the mean biasing function of VIPERS galaxies brighter than $M_B = -19.5 - z - 5 \log(h)$ measured at $R = 4, 6$ and $8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. Different scales are characterised by different colours, as indicated in the plot. The panels show the results in the three redshift shells. The value of δ_{TH} does not change with the cell size, suggesting that the efficiency of galaxy formation in low density regions is quite constant in the range $[4, 8] h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. On the other hand, the slope of the bias relation at $\delta > 0$ does show some scale dependence which is particularly evident at high redshifts.

A more quantitative assessment of scale dependence is obtained by comparing the values of $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}/\bar{b}$ derived from cells of different sizes. The results are shown in Fig. 12. The value of $\hat{b}$ steadily increases with the cell radius, R , especially for VIPERS galaxies in the outer redshift shell. This trend may sound counter intuitive: galaxies are expected to trace the mass with increasing accuracy on larger scale and, consequently, galaxy bias is expected to approach unity. This, however, occurs on scales much larger than those considered here (see e.g. Wild et al. 2005). On the contrary, the halo model predicts that, on the scales explored here, the opposite trend should be observed (see e.g. Fig. 4 of Zehavi et al. 2004). The reason is that in this range of scales the contribution to galaxy clustering of the 1-halo term, which dominates on small scales, is comparable to that of the 2-halo term, which dominates on large scales. The scale of the crossover depends on galaxy type and redshift but it is expected to be bracketed in the range probed by our analysis. This explanation is corroborated by the fact that the values of $\hat{b}$ measured in the HOD-mocks, designed following the halo model prescriptions, do show an increasing trend with the size of the cells.




Fig. 11. Mean biasing function of VIPERS galaxies with $M_B < -19.5 - z - 5 \log(h)$ computed from counts in cells with radii of 4, 6 and $8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. Biasing functions at different scales are indicated with different colours and line-styles, as indicated in the plots. The width of each band represents the 2σ rms scatter in the mocks. The different panels refer to different redshift shells.

An increase of galaxy bias with the scale has been already detected at lower redshifts from the analysis of galaxy clustering (Zehavi et al. 2005) and from weak lensing (Hoekstra et al. 2002; Simon et al. 2007). This is the first detection at relatively high redshift that exploits counts in cell statistics. A small, but significant amount of nonlinearity is detected at all redshifts. Unlike $\hat{b}$, the nonlinear parameter $\hat{b}/\bar{b}$ seems to be scale-independent.

These results are robust to magnitude cut since similar trends for $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}/\bar{b}$ are also seen when one restricts the biasing analysis to objects brighter than $M_B < -19.9 - z - 5 \log(h)$.

5.4. Results from the whole dataset

Table 2 lists the bias parameters measured in the VIPERS subsamples of Table 1 together with random and systematic errors estimated from the mocks. All parameters have been computed by integrating the mean biasing function out to the value δ_{Max} listed in the Table. Altogether the results confirm the various trends that we have described in the previous sections: the value of $\hat{b}$ increases with luminosity, scale and with the redshift beyond $z = 0.9$. Deviations from linear biasing are small but typically detected with significance larger than 1σ . The nonlinear bias parameter is, within the errors, independent of redshift, luminosity or scale.

All errors quoted in the Table were obtained from the analysis of the HOD-based VIPERS mock catalogs. These catalogs do not fully match all characteristics of the real sample. In particular at $z > 0.9$ the mean galaxy number density in the real sample is significantly smaller than in the mocks. Diluting a sample decreases the accuracy of the reconstruction. However, our analysis suggests that this only increases random uncertainties but it does not induce additional systematic errors. As a result, er-




Fig. 12. Moments of the mean biasing functions vs. the size of the cell. Panels from top to bottom refer to different redshift ranges, indicated in the plot. Left panels: $\hat{b}$. Right panels: $\hat{b}/\tilde{b}$. The parameters have been computed assuming $\sigma_8 = 0.9$. Error bars indicate the $1-\sigma$ rms scatter from the mocks.

errors estimated from the mocks are somewhat underestimated at high redshifts. The effect is partially hidden by cosmic variance whose contribution to the error budget is similar to that of shot noise, as we have seen. The cosmic variance contribution to the total error is also listed in Table 2.

6. Comparison with previous results

Several authors have estimated the bias of galaxies in the same range, $z = [0.5, 1.1]$, considered here. The majority of them have assumed linear bias and estimated the bias parameter from galaxy clustering (Coil et al. 2006; Meneux et al. 2006; Coil et al. 2008; Meneux et al. 2008, 2009; Coupon et al. 2012; Marulli et al. 2013; Skibba et al. 2013; Arnalte-Mur et al. 2013). Only a handful of papers have addressed the issue of nonlinear or scale-dependent bias at these redshifts (M05, K11, Simon et al. (2007); Jullo et al. (2012)). In this Section we compare our results with both types of analyses. First we compare our estimated nonlinear bias parameter with available measurements from previous studies. Then we consider the most recent estimates of the linear bias parameter b_{LIN} in this redshift range available in the literature and compare them with our value of $\hat{b}$. In these comparisons all results have been rescaled to the value $\sigma_8 = 0.9$ adopted in this paper whenever required.

6.1. Galaxy bias from counts in cells

In Figure 13 we plot the values of $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}/\tilde{b}$ obtained from our analysis as a function of redshift (filled red dots and red circles) and compare them to those obtained by M05 (green triangles) and K11 (blue squares), that followed a procedure similar to ours. We do not consider here the results of the analyses of Simon et al. (2007) and Jullo et al. (2012) since these authors es-

timate the so-called correlation parameter that accounts for both nonlinearity and stochasticity.

To avoid mixing evolution and luminosity dependence we only considered objects that, at a given redshift, span a similar range of magnitudes. For VIPERS we consider objects with $M_B < -19.1 - z - 5 \log(h)$. For zCOSMOS we consider objects above a similar magnitude cut of $M_B = -19.22 - z - 5 \log(h)$. For the VVDS-Deep sample, M05 use a redshift-independent luminosity threshold of $M_B = -20.0 - 5 \log(h)$ which is comparable with the other cuts in the range $z = [0.8, 1.1]$. For an even more consistent comparison between VIPERS and VVDS we have considered an additional subsample cut at the same constant magnitude limit as M05. The results in this case are represented by the open red circles.

In the case of M05 the values of $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}/\tilde{b}$ shown in the plot have been inferred from the published values of $\tilde{b}$ and $\tilde{b}/\tilde{b}$. In addition, M05 do not provide errors for $\hat{b}/\tilde{b}$. The errorbars shown in the plot have been extrapolated from the errors on $\hat{b}$ under the assumption that the ratio of the errors on $\hat{b}$ and those on $\tilde{b}/\tilde{b}$ does not depend on the dataset. The comparison between zCOSMOS and VIPERS shows that this assumption is approximately valid. The zCOSMOS points are plotted at the centre of their redshift bins. In the VVDS case we added an offset $\Delta_z = +0.1$ to avoid overlapping. Finally, we restrict our comparison to counts in cells of $R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ since this is the minimum cell size considered by K11 and the only one common to the three analyses.

The parameters $\hat{b}$ of the zCOSMOS galaxies are in agreement with those of VIPERS galaxies. In both case they increase with the redshift. The trend is more evident in the zCOSMOS case, while for VIPERS the evolution is detected only with a significance of $\sim 1 \sigma$ only. These results are at variance with those obtained for galaxies in the VVDS-Deep survey. VVDS galaxies are less biased and with no evidence for evolution. However, at $z = 0.8$ where we can compare the three results the discrepancy is about 1σ , possibly increasing at higher redshifts where, as we have seen, the bias of VIPERS galaxies increases rapidly. The mismatch between the bias of VVDS-Deep and zCOSMOS galaxies and its significance have been already discussed by K11 in terms of different clustering properties of the galaxies in the two datasets (McCracken et al. 2007; Meneux et al. 2009; Kováč et al. 2011). Indeed, the zCOSMOS field is characterised by prominent structures and larger spatial coherence as opposed to the VVDS Deep field. This difference has been interpreted as a manifestation of cosmic variance. The VIPERS survey was designed to reduce the impact of cosmic variance and hence solve these types of controversies. In the specific case, the agreement between the bias of VIPERS and zCOSMOS galaxies suggests that the bias of the latter is closer to the cosmic mean than that of the galaxies in the VVDS-Deep field. A similar conclusion was also reached by Marulli et al. (2013) after comparing galaxy clustering in these three fields.

The comparison among the nonlinear bias parameters of the three galaxy samples (lower panel of Fig. 13) corroborates this conclusion. The values of $\hat{b}/\tilde{b}$ for zCOSMOS and VIPERS galaxies agree with each other. Thanks to the smaller error bars these deviations are now detected with higher statistical significance. Deviations from nonlinear bias seem larger in the VVDS-Deep but the statistical significance for this is barely larger than 1σ .

Figure 14 is analogous to Figure 13 but it shows the values of $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{b}/\tilde{b}$ for brighter subsets of VIPERS (red dots) and zCOSMOS (blue squares) galaxies. The magnitude cuts are very similar: $M_B = -19.7 - z - 5 \log(h)$ (VIPERS) and

Table 2. Bias parameters of VIPERS galaxies and their errors.

z -range	M_B - cut $M_B(z=0) - 5 \log(h)$	R h^{-1} Mpc	δ_{MAX}	$\hat{b}$	$\sigma_{\text{RND}}^{\hat{b}}$	$\sigma_{\text{CV}}^{\hat{b}}$	$\sigma_{\text{SYS}}^{\hat{b}}$	$\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$	σ_{RND}^{NL}	σ_{CV}^{NL}	σ_{SYS}^{NL}
0.5 - 0.7	$-18.6 - z$	4	27.3	0.92	0.03	0.02	0.01	1.031	0.005	0.003	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.1 - z$	4	15.0	1.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	1.022	0.006	0.002	-0.004
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.5 - z$	4	12.1	1.10	0.04	0.02	0.02	1.017	0.010	0.002	-0.005
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.9 - z$	4	10.5	1.24	0.05	0.02	0.02	1.005	0.012	0.002	-0.006
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.1 - z$	4	14.6	1.11	0.03	0.02	0.01	1.017	0.004	0.002	-0.002
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.5 - z$	4	14.3	1.13	0.03	0.02	0.02	1.019	0.004	0.001	-0.002
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.9 - z$	4	13.3	1.14	0.04	0.02	0.02	1.023	0.005	0.001	-0.002
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.5 - z$	4	15.4	1.45	0.04	0.02	0.02	1.007	0.006	0.001	-0.002
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.9 - z$	4	13.4	1.47	0.11	0.02	0.03	1.008	0.018	0.001	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-18.6 - z$	6	14.6	1.14	0.04	0.04	0.03	1.014	0.004	0.002	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.1 - z$	6	11.2	1.22	0.05	0.04	0.03	1.013	0.004	0.002	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.5 - z$	6	10.1	1.27	0.06	0.04	0.04	1.010	0.006	0.002	-0.004
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.9 - z$	6	9.7	1.32	0.07	0.05	0.05	1.007	0.007	0.002	-0.004
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.1 - z$	6	12.9	1.34	0.03	0.03	0.02	1.008	0.003	0.002	-0.002
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.5 - z$	6	12.5	1.37	0.03	0.02	0.02	1.008	0.003	0.002	-0.002
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.9 - z$	6	12.3	1.42	0.03	0.03	0.02	1.010	0.004	0.002	-0.002
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.5 - z$	6	14.7	1.84	0.05	0.03	0.01	1.008	0.004	0.001	-0.002
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.9 - z$	6	14.5	1.83	0.06	0.03	0.02	1.013	0.005	0.001	-0.002
0.5 - 0.7	$-18.6 - z$	8	11.7	1.24	0.07	0.05	0.04	1.008	0.005	0.003	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.1 - z$	8	9.4	1.31	0.07	0.05	0.04	1.007	0.004	0.002	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.5 - z$	8	8.7	1.37	0.08	0.06	0.05	1.007	0.005	0.002	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.7 - z$	8	8.2	1.40	0.09	0.06	0.06	1.006	0.005	0.002	-0.003
0.5 - 0.7	$-19.9 - z$	8	8.0	1.45	0.09	0.06	0.06	1.005	0.005	0.002	-0.003
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.1 - z$	8	8.9	1.44	0.04	0.04	0.02	1.003	0.003	0.002	-0.002
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.5 - z$	8	9.0	1.46	0.05	0.04	0.03	1.005	0.003	0.002	-0.002
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.7 - z$	8	9.3	1.48	0.07	0.04	0.03	1.007	0.004	0.002	-0.002
0.7 - 0.9	$-19.9 - z$	8	9.4	1.49	0.08	0.04	0.04	1.007	0.006	0.002	-0.002
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.5 - z$	8	12.2	2.01	0.06	0.04	0.02	1.010	0.003	0.002	-0.002
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.7 - z$	8	12.2	1.98	0.06	0.04	0.03	1.009	0.003	0.003	-0.002
0.9 - 1.1	$-19.9 - z$	8	12.4	2.01	0.07	0.05	0.03	1.015	0.004	0.003	-0.001
0.7 - 0.9	-20.0	8	12.2	1.41	0.04	0.03	0.02	1.005	0.002	0.002	-0.001

Notes. Col. 1 Redshift range. Col. 2 z -dependent B-band magnitude cut. Col. 3 Cell radius [h^{-1} Mpc]. Col. 4: Maximum over-density considered in the analysis. Col. 5: Estimated value of the bias moment $\hat{b}$. Col. 6: Total random error on $\hat{b}$. Col. 7: Cosmic variance contribution to $\hat{b}$ error. Col. 8: Systematic error on $\hat{b}$. Col. 9: Estimated value of the nonlinearity parameter $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$. Col. 10: Total random error on $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$. Col. 11: Cosmic variance contribution to $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$ error. Col. 12: Systematic error on $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$.

$M_B = -19.72 - z - 5 \log(h)$ (zCOSMOS). None of the VVDS-Deep galaxy samples analysed by M05 match these luminosity cuts in this redshift range. These results confirm those obtained with the fainter samples: the values of $\hat{b}$ and $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$ for VIPERS galaxies agree with those of zCOSMOS galaxies in the redshift range in which the two analyses overlap. Nonlinearity is detected at more than $1-\sigma$ only in the VIPERS sample.

6.2. Linear bias from galaxy clustering

In Section 5 we have seen that the bias of VIPERS galaxies deviates from the linear relation at all redshifts and on all scales explored. The amount of non-linearity, quantified by the parameter $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$, is of the order of a few %. We therefore assume that, to first order, we can ignore deviations from linearity and approximate $\hat{b}$ with b_{LIN} . Although reasonably motivated, we stress that we are making an assumption whose validity depends on the sample considered and on the procedure used to estimate b_{LIN} . An accurate comparison would require a detailed comparison for each of the dataset considered here, which is beyond the scope of this paper. In the following we shall directly compare $\hat{b}$ with the

published values of b_{LIN} obtained from different analyses under the linear biasing hypothesis.

Galaxy bias at these redshifts have been estimated from both galaxy clustering and weak lensing. The latter, however, have either focused on bright objects used to trace the Baryonic Acoustic Oscillations (Comparat et al. 2013) or used to explore the bias dependence on the stellar mass (Jullo et al. 2012). Therefore, here we shall not consider these results and consider the values of b_{LIN} obtained from the analysis of galaxy clustering available in the literature.

The result of this comparison is shown in Figure 15. The different symbols in the plots show the most recent estimates of both $\hat{b}$ and b_{LIN} as a function of a magnitude cut (in B-band) in three different redshift bins. The estimates of $\hat{b}$ from our analysis are represented by the large, red circles. These values, as well as those for VVDS-Deep (small orange pentagons) and zCOSMOS (small, light green circles) are computed from counts in cells of $R = 8 h^{-1}$ Mpc. In most cases, the luminosity threshold of the original sample is expressed in the B-band. This is not the case of PRIMUS and CHFTLS-wide that performed magnitude cuts in the g -band. In these two cases the B-band values indicated on the x-axis was obtained by transforming from g to B magnitudes




Fig. 13. Comparison among the values of $\hat{b}$ (top panel) and $\hat{b}/\hat{b}_{\text{LIN}}$ (bottom panel) for zCOSMOS galaxies (blue squares) for VVDS-Deep galaxies (green triangles) and VIPERS galaxies (filled red circles). All samples are luminosity limited and the magnitude cuts are indicated in the plot. The open red circles represents a VIPERS subsample matching the magnitude cut and redshift range of the VVDS-Deep sample. Estimates for the bias parameters of zCOSMOS are taken from K11, those for VVDS-Deep galaxies are from M05.




Fig. 14. Same as figure 13 but referring to brighter VIPERS ($M_B < -19.7 - z - 5 \log(h)$, red dots) and zCOSMOS galaxies ($M_B < -19.72 - z - 5 \log(h)$, blue squares).

according to the g -B vs. z relation measured directly from the VIPERS catalog.

The large red dots in the plots correspond to the values of $\hat{b}$ obtained in our analysis, together with their $1-\sigma$ errors. Note that, unlike in the previous plots, the values of $\hat{b}$ have been corrected for the systematic errors listed in table 2. The blue squares in the plots are taken from Marulli et al. (2013) and refer to the same VIPERS catalog that we have considered in this work. In that paper we have measured the projected 2-point correlation function of the galaxies in the sample, $w_{p,g}(r)$, as a function of redshift and of a B-band luminosity cut and a scale dependent redshift was then computed as $b(r) = \sqrt{w_{p,g}(r)/w_{p,m}(r)}$, where the projected 2-point correlation function of the matter, $w_{p,m}(r)$, was modelled using CAMB (Lewis et al. 2000) and assuming a flat Λ CDM model with $\sigma_8 = 0.8$. The values of b_{LIN} shown in the plot were obtained by averaging $b(r)$ over the range $[1, 10] h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. We note that several b_{LIN} values shown in Figure 15 were estimated with the same procedure and averaging results over the same range of scale. The agreement between b_{LIN} and $\hat{b}$ of the VIPERS galaxies is excellent for $z < 0.9$. In the outer redshift bin, however, the two results are in disagreement. The nature and significance of this disagreement deserves some considerations.

The nature of this mismatch is puzzling. Part of it could be due to our simplistic hypothesis of linear bias, i.e. that the small amount of nonlinear bias detected in our analysis can have a significant effect on the estimate of b_{LIN} from galaxy clustering. The latter has been computed by Marulli et al. (2013) as an unweighted mean between $[1, 10] h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$, meaning that it probably refers to a typical scale smaller than the one used to measure $\hat{b}$ ($R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$). Since nonlinear bias implies scale dependency, we cannot exclude that this could, at least in part, explain the mismatch (if we plot the value of $\hat{b}$ estimated at $R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ then the two measurements agree). An additional, though minor, source of mismatch is incompleteness. At $z \sim 1$ the 90 % completeness limit in VIPERS is $M_B - 5 \log(h) \sim -21.0$ for the red galaxies and about half a magnitude fainter for the blue ones. Since red galaxies are more biased than the blue ones, selecting objects below this luminosity threshold underestimates the bias of the whole galaxy population. The effect is larger for b_{LIN} values since in that case the luminosity threshold is a bit fainter than the one used to compute $\hat{b}$. Finally, it is interesting to notice that a recent, independent estimate of the VIPERS galaxy bias shows a similar mismatch (Cappi et al. in preparation). In that case the authors estimate galaxy bias from the moments of galaxy counts. It turns out that in the range $0.9 < z < 1.1$ the bias parameter estimated from the second-order moment of galaxy and mass PDFs is indeed close to the estimate of Marulli et al. (2013). On the contrary, the linear bias parameter estimated the third-order moments would be larger and in agreement with our value of $\hat{b}$. At $z < 0.9$ the two estimates are in agreement. This further suggests that the origin of the mismatch between our $\hat{b}$ value and the b_{LIN} of Marulli et al. (2013) could be explained in terms of nonlinear, scale-dependent bias.

The green triangles represent the linear bias values obtained from the DEEP2 survey (Coil et al. 2006). This survey probes the redshift range $z = [0.75, 1.2]$. These bias values refer to galaxies brighter than $M_B - 5 \log(h) = -19.0$ and have been computed from the projected 2-point correlation function as in Marulli et al. (2013) using, however, a slightly different model for the correlation function of the mass. Galaxies in the DEEP2 survey are significantly fainter than those in VIPERS. A direct comparison between the bias of the two samples can be

done only for objects brighter than $M_B = -20.5 - 5 \log(h)$ and $z = [0.1, 1.1]$. The linear bias parameter of DEEP2 galaxies is significantly smaller than the value of $\hat{b}$ for VIPERS galaxies obtained here but in agreement with the value of b_{LIN} estimated by Marulli et al. (2013). The same considerations for the origin of this mismatch made above also apply here.

The light blue asterisks were obtained from the Wide part of the Canada-France-Hawaii Legacy Survey (CFHTLS) (Coupon et al. 2012). In this case the bias values were computed from the angular correlation functions of $\sim 3 \times 10^6$ galaxies in the redshift interval $z = [0.2, 1.2]$. Here we only consider results obtained from objects in the redshift bins $z = [0.4, 0.6]$, $z = [0.6, 0.8]$ and $z = [0.8, 1.0]$. In this case b_{LIN} was derived by fitting a Halo Occupation Distribution model to the measured angular correlation function. The linear bias of CFHTLS galaxies agrees well with our results in all redshift bins, including the outer one. We note that those values of b_{LIN} have been computed as integral quantities (the mass-integral over the halo bias weighted by the number of galaxies) and for this reason they are more consistent with $\hat{b}$.

The brown crosses are taken from Skibba et al. (2013). They represent the linear bias computed from the correlation function of galaxies in the PRIMUS catalog, using the same procedure as Marulli et al. (2013). PRIMUS (Coil et al. 2011) is a galaxy survey carried out using a low-resolution spectrograph and complete down to $i < 23$. The dataset, which covers five independent fields (including the COSMOS field), spans the redshift range $z = [0.2, 1.0]$. Here we focus on the interval $z = [0.5, 1.0]$ and, therefore, plot the corresponding bias values in the middle panel. Different points refer to different luminosity cuts (originally specified in the B-band). The bias of PRIMUS galaxies is systematically larger than that of VIPERS galaxies. However, the difference is $\sim 1 \sigma$.

The purple hexagons in the plot show the bias of galaxies in the ALHAMBRA survey (Arnalte-Mur et al. 2013). This is a photometric redshift survey covering 7 independent fields, including DEEP2 and COSMOS. Photometric redshifts are accurate enough to measure the projected galaxy correlation function at different redshifts. The linear bias was estimated as in Marulli et al. (2013). In the figure we show the values of the linear bias computed in three redshift bins: $[0.35, 0.65]$ (top panel), $[0.55, 0.85]$ (middle panel) and $[0.75, 1.05]$ (bottom panel). We did not consider the values in the interval $z = [0.95, 1.25]$. We show two sets of points. Small open hexagons represent the values of b_{LIN} obtained from the clustering of galaxies in all 7 fields (labelled ALHAMBRA+ in the plot). The filled hexagons illustrate the effect of removing two "outlier" fields, COSMOS and ELAIS-N1, which are characterised by a high degree of galaxy clustering (labelled ALHAMBRA-). The bias of galaxies in ALHAMBRA- agrees with ours for $z < 0.9$. In the outer bins there is a 2σ discrepancy that disappears when one includes the objects in the COSMOS and ELAIS-N1 fields.

Finally, we also plot for reference the $\hat{b}$ values of the zCOSMOS (small, light green circles) and VVDS-Deep (small, light brown pentagons) galaxies that are shown in Figures 13 and 14.

7. Discussion and Conclusions

The importance of characterising galaxy bias at intermediate redshifts mainly stems from the need of inferring the properties of the distribution of the mass from that of the galaxies in the planned, future redshift surveys aimed at an accurate estimate of the cosmological parameters. This has triggered several studies aimed at measuring the bias of galaxies at $z > 0.5$ from




Fig. 15. Comparison between the bias parameters $\hat{b}$ and b_{LIN} obtained from galaxy counts and galaxy clustering, respectively. Large red dots: $\hat{b}$ of VIPERS galaxies. Blue squares: b_{LIN} of VIPERS from Marulli et al. (2013). Green triangles: b_{LIN} for DEEP2 galaxies from Coil et al. (2006). Brown crosses: b_{LIN} for PRIMUS galaxies from Skibba et al. (2013). Light blue asterisks: b_{LIN} for CFHTLS galaxies from Coupon et al. (2012). Purple hexagons: b_{LIN} for ALHAMBRA galaxies from Arnalte-Mur et al. (2013). Small, light green dots: $\hat{b}$ for zCOSMOS galaxies from Kovač et al. (2011). Small, light brown pentagons: $\hat{b}$ for VVDS-Deep galaxies from Marinoni et al. (2005). Values of $\hat{b}$ have been measured on a scale $R = 8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$.

weak lensing, galaxy clustering and galaxy counts. Most of these works assume that galaxy bias is linear and deterministic and provide an estimate for the linear bias parameter. In this work we have questioned this assumption and searched for possible deviations from linear bias. This issue has already been investigated by M05 and K11 (using counts in cells) and by Simon et al. (2007) and Jullo et al. (2012) with conflicting evidence.

Our work builds upon these results improving the original strategy of M05 and K11 in several aspects. First of all it is based on a new dataset of $\sim 50,000$ galaxies distributed over a much larger volume than its predecessors. This significantly reduces the impact of cosmic variance that in previous studies dominated the error budget. Secondly, we use a new technique to infer the mean biasing function from counts in cells that, under the hypothesis of local Poisson sampling, accounts and automatically correct for the effect of shot noise. This significantly improves our ability to recover the biasing function since Poisson noise is the main source of stochasticity in the bias relation. Thirdly, thanks to the size of the galaxy sample we are able to explore the bias dependence on magnitude, redshift and scale. We postpone the investigation of additional dependences on galaxy colour and stellar mass to a future analysis to be performed with the final VIPERS sample and new mock galaxy catalogs designed to mimic these galaxy properties.

The main results of our study are:

- The overall qualitative behaviour of the mean biasing function of VIPERS galaxies is similar to that of zCOSMOS and VVDS-Deep galaxies as well as to that of the synthetic VIPERS galaxies in the mock catalogs that we have used to estimate errors. Its shape is close to linear in regions above the mean density, $\delta \geq 0$, steepening for $\delta < 0$, and crossing zero at a finite value δ_{TH} commonly interpreted as a density threshold for galaxy formation.
- The biasing function shows small but significant deviations at all redshifts, scales and magnitude intervals that we have explored. The amount of nonlinearity quantified by the nonlinear parameter $\tilde{b}/\hat{b}$ does not significantly depend on magnitude or on redshift. Scale dependence is also weak. Nonlinearity is higher on a scale of $4 h^{-1}$ Mpc in the lowest redshift bin, but the significance of this is only $\sim 1\sigma$.
- We confirm the dependence of galaxy bias on luminosity. The mean slope $\hat{b}$ of the biasing function, a proxy to linear galaxy bias, increases with the luminosity threshold used to select the galaxy sample. The effect is more significant at lower redshifts (i.e. for $z = [0.5, 0.7]$), probably thanks to the fact that in this bin we are able to probe a larger range of magnitudes. The value of δ_{TH} also increases with the magnitude cut, suggesting that the efficiency of galaxy formation decreases with the luminosity of the object.
- We also confirm that galaxy bias increases with redshifts, as expected in most bias models and verified in previous studies. In our case we find evidence for a rapid evolution beyond $z = 0.9$. This result is highly significant and robust since as it depends neither on the scale nor on the luminosity of the objects. The actual significance of this result depends on the reliability of our error analysis which is based on mock galaxy catalog designed to match the correlation properties of VIPERS galaxies. In this analysis we have explored possible source of systematic errors by modelling all known source of systematic errors, including the magnitude dependence of the spectroscopic sampling rate that was not originally included in the mock catalogs. We find no evidence for systematic errors that might mimic the bias evolution, especially when the bias is quantified by the second order moment $\hat{b}$.
- The value of $\hat{b}$ increases with the scale from 4 to $8 h^{-1}$ Mpc. We interpret this signature in the framework of the halo model as the transition between the 1-halo and 2-halo contribution to galaxy bias. The same trend is also seen in our HOD-mock catalogs and has been detected in previous analyses at lower redshifts of both galaxy clustering (e.g. Zehavi et al. (2005)) and weak lensing (e.g. Hoekstra et al. (2002), Simon et al. (2007)). This is the first time that this effect is detected at these redshifts and using counts in cells statistics.
- We compared our results with those of M05 and K11. These authors performed an analysis similar to the one presented here in a similar range of redshifts. We have limited the comparison on a scale of $8 h^{-1}$ Mpc, which has been investigated in the three analyses and the smallest one explored by K11. We find that the values of $\hat{b}$ of VIPERS and zCOSMOS galaxies agree within the errors but. M05 find a smaller degree of biasing but the difference is of the order of 1σ . We conclude that the apparent discrepancy between K11 and M05 results is a manifestation of Cosmic Variance.
- Deviations from linear biasing were also detected by M05 and K11, although with a lower significance. Our results agree with those of K11. In M05 the degree of nonlinearity is slightly larger than in our case but the discrepancy is barely larger than 1σ . The bias nonlinearity is often expressed in

terms of the parameter b_2 of the second order Taylor expansion of δ (Fry & Gaztanaga 1993). In their recent analysis of the same VIPERS dataset considered in this paper, Cappi *et al.* (in preparation) found a negative value of b_2 for $z \leq 0.9$, in agreement with M05 and Marinoni et al. (2008) and also in qualitative agreement with the results of our analysis. However, the errors on b_2 are quite large in the Cappi *et al.* analysis, and their result is also consistent, within $\sim 1\sigma$ with a pure linear bias. This is due to the fact that Cappi *et al.* determined b_2 using higher order statistics; a procedure that is less sensitive to nonlinear bias than ours.

- Finally, we have compared our estimate of $\hat{b}$ with the values of the linear bias parameter, b_{LIN} , measured from the clustering of galaxies in recent galaxy redshift surveys (DEEP2, PRIMUS, CHFTLS-wide, ALHAMBRA). This comparison is qualitative since it assumes that bias is linear, while our analysis has detected a small, but significant, degree of nonlinearity in the bias of VIPERS galaxies. The comparison is generally successful at $z < 0.9$ where we find a very good agreement with all existing results. In this redshift range our results provide additional evidence in favour of a luminosity dependence bias and of a weak evolution. At $z > 0.9$, where the spread among current results is large, our results favour the case of a significant bias evolution, in agreement with the CHFTLS-wide and ALHAMBRA analyses.

Our results confirm the importance of going beyond the simplistic linear biasing hypothesis. Galaxy bias is a complicated phenomenon. It can be non-deterministic, non-local and non-linear. In this work we focused on deviations from linearity under the assumption that stochasticity is dominated by (and, consequently, accounted for) Poisson noise and that nonlocal effects are smoothed out within the volume of our cells. While the validity and the impact of these assumptions can (and will) need to be tested, our results show that the application of an improved statistical tool to the new VIPERS dataset is already able to detect deviations from linear bias with $5 - 10\%$ accuracy.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the crucial contribution of the ESO staff for the management of service observations. In particular, we are deeply grateful to M. Hilker for his constant help and support of this program. Italian participation to VIPERS has been funded by INAF through PRIN 2008 and 2010 programs. LG and BRG acknowledge support of the European Research Council through the Darklight ERC Advanced Research Grant (# 291521). OLF acknowledges support of the European Research Council through the EARLY ERC Advanced Research Grant (# 268107). Polish participants have been supported by the Polish Ministry of Science (grant N N203 51 29 38), the Polish-Swiss Astro Project (co-financed by a grant from Switzerland, through the Swiss Contribution to the enlarged European Union), the European Associated Laboratory Astrophysics Poland-France HECOLS and a Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Postdoctoral Fellowship for Foreign Researchers (P11802). GDL acknowledges financial support from the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement n. 202781. WJP and RT acknowledge financial support from the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement n. 202686. WJP is also grateful for support from the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council

through the grant ST/I001204/1. EB, FM and LM acknowledge the support from grants ASI-INAF I/023/12/0 and PRIN MIUR 2010-2011. LM also acknowledges financial support from PRIN INAF 2012. YM acknowledges support from CNRS/INSU (Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers) and the Programme National Galaxies et Cosmologie (PNCG). CM is grateful for support from specific project funding of the *Institut Universitaire de France* and the LABEX OCEVU. MV is supported by FP7-ERC grant “cosmoIGM” and by PD-INFN INDARK. CDP wishes to thank Pangea Formazione S.r.l. for supporting her in the final stages of this work.

References

- Anderson, L., Aubourg, E., Bailey, S., et al. 2012, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 427, 3435
- Arnalte-Mur, P., Martínez, V. J., Norberg, P., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
- Basilikos, S., Plionis, M., Kovač, K., & Voglis, N. 2007, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 378, 301
- Baugh, C. M. 2013, *PASA*, 30, 30
- Bel, J. & Marinoni, C. 2014, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 563, A36
- Bel, J., Marinoni, C., Granett, B. R., et al. 2014, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 563, A37
- Blanton, M., Cen, R., Ostriker, J. P., Strauss, M. A., & Tegmark, M. 2000, *Astron. Astrophys. J.*, 531, 1
- Bottini, D., Garilli, B., Maccagni, D., et al. 2005, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.*, 117, 996
- Bower, R. G., Benson, A. J., Malbon, R., et al. 2006, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 370, 645
- Branchini, E. 2001, ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints
- Cacciato, M., Lahav, O., van den Bosch, F. C., Hoekstra, H., & Dekel, A. 2012, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 426, 566
- Casas-Miranda, R., Mo, H. J., Sheth, R. K., & Boerner, G. 2002, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 333, 730
- Coil, A. L., Blanton, M. R., Burles, S. M., et al. 2011, *Astrophys. J.*, 741, 8
- Coil, A. L., Newman, J. A., Cooper, M. C., et al. 2006, *Astrophys. J.*, 644, 671
- Coil, A. L., Newman, J. A., Croton, D., et al. 2008, *Astrophys. J.*, 672, 153
- Coles, P. & Jones, B. 1991, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 248, 1
- Colless, M., Dalton, G., Maddox, S., et al. 2001, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 328, 1039
- Colombi, S. 1994, *Astrophys. J.*, 435, 536
- Comparat, J., Jullo, E., Kneib, J.-P., et al. 2013, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 433, 1146
- Conroy, C., Wechsler, R. H., & Kravtsov, A. V. 2006, *Astrophys. J.*, 647, 201
- Contreras, S., Baugh, C., Norberg, P., & Padilla, N. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
- Cooray, A. & Sheth, R. 2002, *Phys. Rept.*, 372, 1
- Coupon, J., Kilbinger, M., McCracken, H. J., et al. 2012, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 542, A5
- Cucciati, O., Granett, B. R., Branchini, E., et al. 2014, ArXiv e-prints
- de la Torre, S., Guzzo, L., Peacock, J. A., Branchini, E., & Iovino, A. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
- de la Torre, S. & Peacock, J. A. 2012, ArXiv e-prints
- De Lucia, G. & Blaizot, J. 2007, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 375, 2
- Dekel, A. & Lahav, O. 1999, *Astrophys. J.*, 520, 24
- Fritz, A., Scodeggio, M., Ilbert, O., et al. 2014, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 563, A92
- Fry, J. N. & Gaztanaga, E. 1993, *Astrophys. J.*, 413, 447
- Garilli, B., Guzzo, L., Scodeggio, M., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
- Gaztañaga, E., Cabré, A., & Hui, L. 2009, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 399, 1663
- Gaztañaga, E., Norberg, P., Baugh, C. M., & Croton, D. J. 2005, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 364, 620
- Guzzo, L., Pierleoni, M., Meneux, B., et al. 2008, *Nature*, 451, 541
- Guzzo, L., Scodeggio, M., Garilli, B., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
- Hawkins, E., Maddox, S., Branchini, E., & Saunders, W. 2001, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 325, 589
- Hoekstra, H., van Waerbeke, L., Gladders, M. D., Mellier, Y., & Yee, H. K. C. 2002, *Astrophys. J.*, 577, 604
- Jullo, E., Rhodes, J., Kiessling, A., et al. 2012, *Astrophys. J.*, 750, 37
- Kaiser, N. 1987, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 227, 1
- Kayo, I., Suto, Y., Nichol, R. C., et al. 2004, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Japan*, 56, 415
- Kofman, L., Bertschinger, E., Gelb, J. M., Nusser, A., & Dekel, A. 1994, *Astrophys. J.*, 420, 44
- Kovač, K., Porciani, C., Lilly, S. J., et al. 2011, *Astrophys. J.*, 731, 102
- Laureijs, R., Amiaux, J., Arduini, S., et al. 2011, ArXiv e-prints
- Le Fèvre, O., Saisse, M., Mancini, D., et al. 2003, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, Vol. 4841, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, ed. M. Iye & A. F. M. Moorwood, 1670–1681
- Lewis, A., Challinor, A., & Lasenby, A. 2000, *Astrophys. J.*, 538, 473
- Marinoni, C., Guzzo, L., Cappi, A., et al. 2008, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 487, 7
- Marinoni, C., Le Fèvre, O., Meneux, B., et al. 2005, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 442, 801
- Marulli, F., Bolzonella, M., Branchini, E., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
- McCracken, H. J., Peacock, J. A., Guzzo, L., et al. 2007, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.*, 172, 314
- Meneux, B., Guzzo, L., de la Torre, S., et al. 2009, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 505, 463
- Meneux, B., Guzzo, L., Garilli, B., et al. 2008, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 478, 299
- Meneux, B., Le Fèvre, O., Guzzo, L., et al. 2006, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 452, 387
- Mustapha, H. & Dimitrakopoulos, R. 2010, *Computers and Geosciences*, 36, 313
- Nishimichi, T., Kayo, I., Hikage, C., et al. 2007, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Japan*, 59, 93
- Norberg, P., Baugh, C. M., Hawkins, E., et al. 2002, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 332, 827
- Norberg, P., Baugh, C. M., Hawkins, E., et al. 2001, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 328, 64
- Nuza, S. E., Sanchez, A. G., Prada, F., et al. 2012, ArXiv e-prints
- Percival, W. J., Cole, S., Eisenstein, D. J., et al. 2007, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 381, 1053
- Pollo, A., Guzzo, L., Le Fèvre, O., et al. 2006, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 451, 409
- Prada, F., Klypin, A. A., Cuesta, A. J., Betancort-Rijo, J. E., & Primack, J. 2012, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 423, 3018
- Reid, B. A., Samushia, L., White, M., et al. 2012, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 426, 2719
- Schlegel, D., Abdalla, F., Abraham, T., et al. 2011, ArXiv e-prints
- Scodeggio, M., Franzetti, P., Garilli, B., Le Fèvre, O., & Guzzo, L. 2009, *The Messenger*, 135, 13
- Seo, H.-J. & Eisenstein, D. J. 2003, *Astrophys. J.*, 598, 720
- Sigad, Y., Branchini, E., & Dekel, A. 2000, *Astrophys. J.*, 540, 62
- Simon, P., Hettterscheidt, M., Schirmer, M., et al. 2007, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 461, 861
- Skibba, R. A., Smith, M. S. M., Coil, A. L., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
- Somerville, R. S., Lemson, G., Sigad, Y., et al. 2001, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 320, 289
- Springel, V., White, S. D. M., Jenkins, A., et al. 2005, *Nature*, 435, 629
- Swanson, M. E. C., Tegmark, M., Blanton, M., & Zehavi, I. 2008, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 385, 1635
- Szapudi, I., Branchini, E., Frenk, C. S., Maddox, S., & Saunders, W. 2000, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 318, L45
- Szapudi, I. & Pan, J. 2004, *Astrophys. J.*, 602, 26
- Tegmark, M. & Bromley, B. C. 1999, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 518, L69
- Ueda, H. & Yokoyama, J. 1996, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 280, 754
- Vale, A. & Ostriker, J. P. 2004, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 353, 189
- Verde, L., Heavens, A. F., Percival, W. J., et al. 2002, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 335, 432
- Viel, M., Branchini, E., Cen, R., et al. 2005, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 360, 1110
- Villaescusa-Navarro, F., Marulli, F., Viel, M., et al. 2014, *J. Cosm. Astro-Particle Phys.*, 3, 11
- Wang, Y. 2008, *JCAP*, 0805, 021
- White, S. D. M. & Frenk, C. S. 1991, *Astrophys. J.*, 379, 52
- Wild, V., Peacock, J. A., Lahav, O., et al. 2005, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 356, 247
- Yoshikawa, K., Taruya, A., Jing, Y. P., & Suto, Y. 2001, *Astrophys. J.*, 558, 520
- Zehavi, I., Blanton, M. R., Frieman, J. A., et al. 2002, *Astrophys. J.*, 571, 172
- Zehavi, I., Weinberg, D. H., Zheng, Z., et al. 2004, *Astrophys. J.*, 608, 16
- Zehavi, I., Zheng, Z., Weinberg, D. H., et al. 2011, *Astrophys. J.*, 736, 59
- Zehavi, I., Zheng, Z., Weinberg, D. H., et al. 2005, *Astrophys. J.*, 630, 1
- Zheng, Z., Berlind, A. A., Weinberg, D. H., et al. 2005, *Astrophys. J.*, 633, 791
- Zucca, E., Bardelli, S., Bolzonella, M., et al. 2009, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 508, 1217

- ¹ INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Bologna, via Ranzani 1, I-40127 Bologna, Italy
- ² Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, via della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Roma, Italy
- ³ INFN - Sezione di Roma Tre, via della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Roma, Italy
- ⁴ INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, via Frascati 33, I-00040 Monte Porzio Catone (RM), Italy
- ⁵ INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Brera, Via Brera 28, 20122 Milano, via E. Bianchi 46, I-23807 Merate, Italy
- ⁶ Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia - Università di Bologna, viale Berti Pichat 6/2, I-40127 Bologna, Italy
- ⁷ INFN - Sezione di Bologna, viale Berti Pichat 6/2, I-40127 Bologna, Italy
- ⁸ Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, LAM (Laboratoire d'Astrophysique de Marseille) UMR 7326, 13388, Marseille, France
- ⁹ INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Trieste, via G. B. Tiepolo 11, I-34143 Trieste, Italy
- ¹⁰ INFN - Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Via Valerio 2, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ¹¹ Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano-Bicocca, P.zza della Scienza 3, I-20126 Milano, Italy
- ¹² Centre de Physique Théorique, UMR 6207 CNRS-Université de Provence, Case 907, F-13288 Marseille, France
- ¹³ Astronomical Observatory of the Jagiellonian University, Orla 171, 30-001 Cracow, Poland
- ¹⁴ National Centre for Nuclear Research, ul. Hoza 69, 00-681 Warszawa, Poland
- ¹⁵ INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Torino, I-10025 Pino Torinese, Italy
- ¹⁶ Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope, 65–1238 Mamalahoa Highway, Kamuela, HI 96743, USA
- ¹⁷ INAF - Istituto di Astrofisica Spaziale e Fisica Cosmica Milano, via Bassini 15, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ¹⁸ Laboratoire Lagrange, UMR7293, Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, CNRS, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur, 06300 Nice, France
- ¹⁹ Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Academia Sinica, P.O. Box 23-141, Taipei 10617, Taiwan
- ²⁰ Institute of Physics, Jan Kochanowski University, ul. Swietokrzyska 15, 25-406 Kielce, Poland
- ²¹ Department of Particle and Astrophysical Science, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, 464-8602 Nagoya, Japan
- ²² Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, UMR7095 CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, 98 bis Boulevard Arago, 75014 Paris, France
- ²³ Universitätssternwarte München, Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, Scheinerstr. 1, D-81679 München, Germany
- ²⁴ Max-Planck-Institut für Extraterrestrische Physik, D-84571 Garching b. München, Germany
- ²⁵ Institute of Cosmology and Gravitation, Dennis Sciama Building, University of Portsmouth, Burnaby Road, Portsmouth, PO1 3FX, UK
- ²⁶ INAF - Istituto di Astrofisica Spaziale e Fisica Cosmica Bologna, via Gobetti 101, I-40129 Bologna, Italy
- ²⁷ INAF - Istituto di Radioastronomia, via Gobetti 101, I-40129 Bologna, Italy
- ²⁸ SUPA - Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Royal Observatory, Blackford Hill, Edinburgh, EH9 3HJ, UK
- ²⁹ Università degli Studi di Milano, via G. Celoria 16, I-20130 Milano, Italy
- ³⁰ Department of Astronomy, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720